DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 573 TM 810 458

AUTHOR	Callanan, Charles
TITLE	A Feasibility Study to Demonstrate the Usefulness of Formative Evaluation in Improving the Quality of E.S.E.A. Title One Programs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Portland Public Schools, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY	Maine State Dept. of Educational and Cultural Services, Augusta.
PUB DATE	Aug 80
NOTE	167p.; Prepared through the Department of Research and Evaluation.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Compensatory Education; Elementary School Mathematics; *Evaluation Methods; *Formative Evaluation; Intermediate Grades; Predictor Variables; *Program Effectiveness; Reading Achievement; *Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; Portland Public Schools ME; Process Measures

ABSTRACT

The formative evaluation carried out indicated that helpful information and suggestions can be procured by a process evaluation developed on an on-going basis and that constructive feedback for possible program changes can be initiated almost from the very first day. Attempts to relate summative evaluation results to program patterns proved to be extremely difficult because of the fluctuation of program practices and students to be included. However, on the basis of the experience gained from this study, the authors recommend that formative evaluation should be an integral part of program evaluation. (BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205573

A FEASIBILITY STUDY TO DEMONSTRATE THE USEFULNESS

OF

FORMATIVE EVALUATION IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF E.S.E.A. TITLE ONE PROGRAMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Callanan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL REPORT

by

Charles Callanan, Evaluation Consultant

and

Balwant Singh, Project Director

TM 810 458

August 1980

Department of Research and Evaluation, Portland Public Schools, Portland, Maine

This study was made possible by a grant from the Maine Department of Education and Cultural Services, Augusta, Maine

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	4
II.	PROCEDURE	4
III.	SOME LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY	11
IV.	SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS	12
V.	FORMATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS	17
	A. Goals and Objectives	17
	B. In-Service Training	22
	C. Diagnostic Testing and Prescriptive Program Writing	29
	D. Student Identification	34
	E. Communications	40
	F. Tables of Organization and Responsibility	45
	G. Uniformity and Consistency	49
	H. Staffing Arrangements	55
	I. Instructional Programs	64
	J. Impact Upon the Classroom Teacher	71
	K. Distribution of Title I Services	79
VI.	RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT TEST RESULTS TO PROGRAM DIFFERENCES	82
VII.	EVALUATION OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY	99
VIII.	APPLICABILITY OF PROCESS EVALUATION MODEL TO OTHER TITLE I SCHOOL SYSTEMS	111
IX.	CONCLUSIONS	118
X.	REFERENCES	119
XI.	APPENDICES*	120

*Appendices A, B, D, E, F, G, H and I were included with the Interim Report and are not repeated herein. Addidtional copies are available at the Office of Research and Evaluation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank the staff of all the Title I schools visited for their hospitality and cooperation during this evaluation and Donald Christie of the Maine Department of Education and Cultural Services for his assistance during the course of this study. The report is particularly indebted to the good offices of Dr. Roland Kimball of the University of New Hampshire, to the Title I Coordinator, Steven Adamowski, and the Mathematics and Reading Directors, Jacqueline Mitchell and Carol Eddy, to consultant Dr. Mildred Kaye, to James Watkins, Assistant Director of the Department of Research and Evaluation and finally to Donald Cichon of the Title I Portsmouth Technical Assistance Center, RMC Corporation. Although the counsel of all these associates was extremely helpful, they are obviously in no way responsible for any errors, omissions or shortcomings that may be attributed to this study.

TERMINOLOGY USED IN THE REPORT

The following abbreviations and terminology have been used in this report where appropriate:

Aides and Assistants	= "Aides"
Central Office Personnel	= "CO"
Classroom Teacher	= "T"
Code Number	= The names of all schools, teachers, and staff members have been numerically coded to maintain anonymity as much as possible.
Date of Information Collected	= Because of the changing nature of the Title I programs during this evaluation, except as otherwise indicated data presented is descriptive of the situation as it existed at the time of the school visitations. (February 1980)
District Parents Advisory Council	= "DAC"
Intermediate	= Grades 4, 5 and 6
Large School (#1, #5, and #7)	= A school whose gross Title I student population was over two hundred.
Mathematics Consultant	= "MC"
Parents Advisory Council (Local)	= "PAC"
Primary	= Grades 1, 2 and 3
Principal	= "P"
Pupil Evaluation Team	= "PET"
Reading Consultant	= "RC"
Senior Author*	= "Evaluator"
Small School (#2, #3, #4 and #6)	= A school whose gross Title I student population was under two hundred.
Social Worker**	= "SW"
Title I Staff	= This includes aides and assistants, social workers, mathematics consultants and reading consultants (although most reading consultants were shifted to local funding during the course of this study).

* Note that both Charles Callanan, Senior Author, and Dr. Balwant Singh, Director of the office of Research and Evaluation shared responsibilities in the evaluation of the Program. To reduce unnecessary terminology etc. the term "evaluator" in this paper will be used to refer to Mr. Callanan in his role as Senior Author.

** In some school systems this staff member is referred to as a "home school Coordinator."

INTRODUCTION

Until the 1979-80 school year, only summative (product) evaluations had been used to carry out the evaluation of Title I programs in the Portland Public Schools, because of the lack of sufficient resources. Although the said summative evaluations were conducted with scientific rigor, the results were not helpful in making changes in the Title I programs of various schools, primarily due to the nature of the experimental design used under the circumstances. The only purpose the summative evaluations had seemed to serve was to meet the state and federal requirements.

One of the steps taken to overcome the difficulties encountered in the past, was to obtain a grant of over $20,000 from the Department of Educational and Cultural Services in Augusta, "to demonstrate the usefulness of carrying out formative (process) evaluation of Title I programs."

Objectives: The objectives of the study are twofold. First to determine whether helpful information can be secured through process evaluation to improve program effectiveness in the Portland Schools. Next to attempt to identify which program differences if any in the seven participating schools seem to be coincident with student test gains. It is hoped that, if successful, the methods used in this kind of process evaluation might be utilized by other school systems to improve their own Title I programs.

PROCEDURE

Summative Evaluation

Students who had scored below the 25th percentile on either the Reading, the

Mathematics Computation; or the Mathematics Basic Concepts sub-tests of STEP series III administered in the spring of 1979, or who on the basis of judgements of the faculty needed such attention were selected for remedial work. The STEP III Pre-tests used in the Model A Analysis were administered in the Fall of 1979 and the post tests were given in the spring of 1980. Needless to say only those students were included in the study for whom both the pre and post test scores were available.

The three non-Title I elementary schools in the Portland Public School System were used as control schools to facilitate the interpretation of test results. Students in these schools, who had scored at or below the 25th percentile on any one or more of the said sub-tests of STEP, were also given the aforementioned pre and post tests.

Analysis: Model A of the U.S.O.E. Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS) was used to analyze the data. The U.S. Office of Education requires that all Title 1 programs be evaluated using one of the three methods, or "Models" as they are called, developed by it. The Portland Public School System has decided to use the so-called "Model A Analysis" which is based upon the pre and post test performance of the students served. Additional details can be found in the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System Manual, or by contacting the Office of Research and Evaluation.

Formative Evaluation

The overall plan for process evaluation was drawn up in a series of meetings in November and December 1979 attended by the authors, representatives of the Portsmouth TAC, Mr. Watkins, Assistant Director of the office of Research and Evaluation, and Dr. Mildred Kaye. In addition preliminary meetings were held with the Title I Coordinator, the reading and mathematics directors, and all of the system's elementary principals to solicit their suggestions. Aided by the input from these

conferences, a tentative time table was drawn up to coordinate with that submitted in the original grant request and the following decisions were reached.

1. The process evaluation would be broken down into four general categories: a) the organizational stage lasting from December through the end of January during which time instruments would be designed, literature reviewed, decisions made as to the details of the evaluation, and Title I staff visited to apprise them of the nature of the study and to enlist their suggestions. b) The information gathering stage lasting from the beginning of February through early June during which time schools were to be visited (in two cycles). c) The initial recommendation stage (mid-April) when interim suggestions were to be made to Title I decision makers and d) The Final Report stage when all information was to be evaluated, the feasibility study itself evaluated by staff, and the results of the process evaluation compared with student test gains.

2. The primary focus of school visitations would be to observe the functioning of the Title I staff, and although the Portland Title I process would be viewed through an analysis of both the staff and the students, priority would be given to the implementation of the program through staff effectiveness. The second cycle of class observations would place more emphasis upon analysis of program effect upon the student. In school systems where the Title I program is sufficiently different from the normal instructional patterns as to be easily identifiable (this is not the case in Portland) the evaluators feel it would be more desirable to place a greater emphasis of the process evaluation upon student observation.

3. It was decided that information would be obtained through a three-pronged approach in which personal interviews, school records and classroom observations would all tend to enlarge the picture of process

and tend to reinforce and substantiate one another. The goal is to answer the questions: "What do people say they do?"; "How do the records describe what they have done?"; and "How do the actual observations relate with the first two information sources?"

The first priority item in this study once the basic format was formulated was to explain the purpose of the evaluation to all those adults involved with the Title I program, to introduce the evaluator to those individuals to ease any anxieties that might have arisen concerning the evaluation and to involve as many participants as possible in the organizational enterprise. To accomplish this, during December 1979 and January 1980 the evaluator met individually with the principals and assistant principals of the seven schools to be evaluated, all Title I staff involved, the Title I Coordinator, the Superintendent and the Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education and the Reading and Mathematics Directors. (The Title I Coordinator is also the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education). The evaluator also met with the District Parents Advisory Council. During this period the evaluator both verbally and in writing made it clear that it was not the purpose of the study either to audit program compliance or to evaluate individual performance.

In conjunction with these initial interviews aimed at program design, two questionnaires (Appendix A) were designed, one for use by the Title I staff and 4th, 5th and 6th grade classroom teachers, the other to be utilized by program decision makers, the District Advisory Council, certain central office personnel and the Title I principals. The purpose of the questionnaires was to determine what specific categories of information the Title I population thought would be helpful, what program factors were felt to be critical to efficient Title I operation, and what kinds of decisions would be apt to be made on the basis of the study.

Several factors determined the final selection as to the nature and extent of information to be gathered and studied: the responses to the above mentioned questionnaires from the Title I community, the requests for specific program information from the Title I Coordinator and the Superintendent of Schools, and the findings of current educational research as to what program characteristics have been identified with exemplary Title I programs. Using this input, eleven topics were selected for inclusion in the study. They are:

Goals and objectives

In-service training

Diagnostic testing and prescriptive program writing

Student identification

Communications

Tables of organization and responsibility

Uniformity and consistency

Staffing arrangements and personnel scheduling practices

Instructional programs

Impact of Title I program upon the classroom teacher

Distribution of Title I services

Once the areas to be examined were established, it was decided that in view of the characteristics of the Portland Title I program which is almost exclusively personnel oriented, the desired information could best be obtained through a combination of interviews and class observations.

Since one of the central purposes of this study is to determine whether useful information can be generated in such a manner and within such a time frame as to make program improvement possible, the evaluation was planned in two school visitation cycles with the first cycle scheduled so that an interim report would be available to the Title I Coordinator before decisions had to be made concerning the

design of the succeeding year's program. To accomplish this, the May 1980 deadline which had been originally scheduled for the "Interim Report" presentation was advanced by one month to April. This report included both the preliminary suggestions submitted to Steven Adamowski, Title I Coordinator, on February 8, 1980 (Appendix B hereafter referred to as "Preliminary Suggestions") as well as other suggestions developed as of that date, particularly those the implementation of which, would require budgetary commitments for the coming year. These suggestions have been incorporated into appropriate sections of this final report which summarizes the results of both visitation cycles.

During the first cycle all principals and administrators having impact upon the Title I program, all Title I staff and one half of the randomly selected classroom teachers in Title I schools grades 4, 5 and 6 were interviewed. (In actuality 84 individual interviews were conducted.) The reading consultants who began as Title I funded staff but reverted in mid-year to local funding were interviewed as well. In addition, in each school which had aides or assistants involved in direct classroom activity, attempt was made to visit at least one randomly selected aide in the classroom at each grade level in three thirty-minute observations. In all 13 aides were observed on 38 occasions. High absenteeism on the part of the aides and classroom teachers, as well as scheduling problems encountered in the field, made some adjustment of these visitations necessary. The representatives of the Portland Teachers' Association and the aides and assistants professional sub group were visited on a number of occasions in an effort to insure that they be kept advised of developments and have an opportunity for input. Finally, all Title I principals were contacted after their schools had been visited to give them evaluative feedback, and meetings were held

with concerned staff in all Title I schools to offer them the opportunity for similar feedback and rebuttal as soon as possible after the school visitation.

It was anticipated that plans for the 2nd cycle would be contingent upon results of the 1st cycle and that in general, emphasis would be placed upon more student observation than was possible during the 1st cycle. However, any area identified in the 1st cycle as being of singular interest or of requiring more in depth study would receive attention. In actual practice much of the second cycle was spent in gathering information to study the impact of prescriptive and diagnostic activity as well as social worker activity upon the test performance of certain randomly selected students (see Appendix C) and in finishing up any "loose ends" that had been left incomplete because of scheduling problems encountered in the 1st cycle. As will be discussed more at length in the section on APPLICABILITY OF PROCESS EVALUATION FOR OTHER TITLE I SCHOOL SYSTEMS, the evaluator questions the number of days set aside for school visitation and suggests the possibility that shorter visits might be equally productive.

The interview forms and class observation instruments necessary for the school visitations were designed in conjunction with Dr. Kaye and Mr. Cichon to gather information on the eleven topics to be studied and were briefly field tested before being finalized (Appendix D). Each instrument was tested in the field on a limited basis only because of time constraints to check both the appropriateness of the questions and the approximate time requirement for each interview.

While discussing the findings of the process evaluation, an attempt has been made to point out those instances where suggestions are the result of the evaluation consultant's subjective judgements and not the outgrowth of specific data. During preliminary phases of this study the

evaluator indicated he would do everything he could to see that both staff and schools remained anonymous. This policy has resulted in the use of codes in place of names throughout the evaluation, and unfortunately may also have made parts of the report not as clear as they otherwise might have been for the reader. For this inconvenience the author apologizes.

Delimitations: Because of the lack of time and money, the study was confined to grades 4, 5 and 6 of various Title I schools. The three island schools although qualifying for Title I services, were not included in this study because of the extremely small number of Title I students in each. Besides, the transportation facilities to and from those islands pose difficult problems in logistics.

SOME LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

Attention is drawn to the fact that the evaluation was to a degree complicated by a number of circumstances which prevailed during the period of study. First, a number of schools were in the process of planning and effecting adjustments in their operations to bring themselves into complete compliance with the new Title I Guidelines by the beginning of the next school year and were, therefore, in a state of transition. Besides this, the initial composition of the Title I staff was substantially altered after the evaluation had begun: three reading consultants who had initially been funded with Title I monies were through School Committee action "picked up" by local funds as of January 1, 1980. However, although these reading consultants were no longer classified as Title I employees, there was little apparent difference in the services which they provided the Title I program after the transition, and for the purposes of this study they have been included as though they were, in fact, Title I employees. The funds made available for additional Title I services by this transfer (approximately $32,000. for the remainder of

the year) were utilized by those three schools affected to secure additional Title I personnel or materials.

In addition, substantially more Title I funds ($59.178) became available later in the academic year as part of a Federal low income concentration grant which was prorated among all the Portland Title I Schools. (Appendix E) Despite these unforeseen changes in program, it was decided not to alter the evaluation already in progress but to document the changes and continue the study as planned. An additional motivation for completing the program was to observe the effectiveness of this kind of evaluation under realistic field conditions where unanticipated changes in plans are a fact of life and must be taken into consideration.

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS

Tables A and B show the results of the aforementioned Model A Analysis, carried out. The number of students in school #2 who had both pre and post test scores was too small to be worth including in Table A. The data from schools 4 and 6 had to be combined because of the small number of students in each school. It had also seemed appropriate to combine the data from those two schools because they are served by the same principal and consultants and the programs there are very similar.

It can be seen in Table A page 13 that Title I students in all schools made gains in the area of reading and the gains were the highest for students in school 7 and the lowest for the ones in schools 4 and 6 combined. Students in all grades of schools 1, 3 and 7 made gains but the grade 5 students in school 5 and schools 4 and 6 combined, seem to have lost ground. Although the number of students at schools 4 and 6

Table A

TITLE I EVALUATION: MODEL A ANALYSIS

DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE NCE GAINS IN READING BY GRADES AND SCHOOLS

SCHOOL	School #5		School #7		School #1		School #4 & 6		School #3		TOTAL		CONTROL SCHOOLS	
Grade	# of Students	NCE Gain	# of Students	NCE Gain	# of Students	NCE Gain	# of Students	NCE Gain	# of Students	NCE Gain	# of Students	NCE Gain	# of Students	NCE Gain
4	48	7.333	25	9.280	19	5.632	7	1.280	19	4.474	123	6.447	21	5.714
5	36	-0.583	27	5.259	24	1.125	8	-3.625	9	2.444	104	1.356	10	7.001
6	40	5.475	26	9.077	20	6.700	11	5.990	5	2.600	102	6.549	11	0.909
Sub-Total	124	4.435	78	7.820	63	4.254	26	1.768	33	3.636	329	4.869	42	4.762

combined is too small to indicate any stable trend, it should be noted that the grade 5 students at school number 6* have lost considerable ground in Reading. Overall, the students in all grades seem to have made gains but the ones for grades 4 and 6 are much higher than the ones for grade 5. No explanation comes to mind for this relatively poor performance of the grade 5 students. A comparable group of grade 5 students in the control schools seems to have done very well. The gains of the grade 6 students from the control schools seem to be the least. It is interesting to note that on the whole, the 42 non-Title I students did almost as well as the 329 Title I students from those grades.

The finding that comparable groups of non-Title I students are doing almost as well as the Title I students has been reported in several of our previous studies, dealing with the evaluation of Title I programs, (Singh and Jones, 1974; Singh and Hammond, 1976; Singh, 1977; and Watkins and Singh, 1978). Although the technique of evaluation employed this year is considerably different from the ones used in the past, the results are very similar. We would guess that the locally funded staff in the control schools provide services to low achievers, which are very similar to the ones provided by the Title 1 staff in the Title I schools. Besides, the services of the special education staff are also available system-wide, and they serve more or less the same population of low achievers.

Table B page 15 shows the outcome of Model A Analysis in the area of Mathematics in the form of a distribution of average NCE gains by schools, grades and sub-tests. It can be seen in Table B that on the whole, only the students in grade 5 showed any progress in the area of Mathematics Computation and that the gains were the highest for students in school 3. Overall, the students in school 5 did not show any gains in the area of Mathematics Computation and the ones in school 1 and school 4 and 6

* All of the eight grade 5 students listed in Table A were from school 6.

Table B

TITLE I EVALUATION: MODEL A ANALYSIS

DISTRIBUTION OF AVERAGE NCE GAINS IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADES, SCHOOLS AND SUBTESTS

SCHOOL		School #5		School #2		School #7		School #1		School #4,6		School #3		CONTROL SCHOOLS		TOTAL*	
	Grade	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	# of Stud.	NCE Gain
Math Computation	4	41	-3.829	9	-0.778	18	0.722	13	-4.538	11	.091	17	7.294	33	0.576	109	-0.798
	5	52	4.115	5	10.000	23	7.043	31	-0.968	7	2.858	14	7.429	28	10.321	132	3.939
	6	40	-1.425	10	5.300	26	2.923	24	-2.583	11	-2.364	7	-0.286	13	.692	118	-0.153
Sub-total		133	-0.000	24	4.000	67	3.746	68	-2.221	29	-0.240	38	5.947	7	4.284	359	1.156
Math Basic Concepts	4	40	2.600	9	2.667	18	3.944	13	7.000	10	.300	19	5.000	33	4.303	109	3.560
	5	50	1.320	5	-8.800	22	5.591	31	3.032	11	6.818	14	4.643	28	5.000	133	2.850
	6	38	-4.658	10	5.300	25	-1.600	24	4.583	14	2.714	8	1.500	12	-1.750	119	-0.034
Sub-total		128	-0.055	24	1.375	65	2.369	68	4.338	35	3.314	41	4.195	73	3.575	361	2.113
Math** Combined	4	81	-0.654	18	.945	36	2.333	26	1.231	21	.095	36	6.083	66	2.440	2[illegible]	1.381
	5	102	2.745	10	.500	45	6.333	62	1.032	18	5.278	28	6.036	56	7.661	265	3.392
	6	78	-3.000	20	5.300	51	.706	48	1.000	25	.479	15	.667	25	.480	237	-0.093
Sub-total		261	-0.027	48	2.688	132	3.068	136	1.059	64	1.703	79	5.038	147	4.096	720	1.636

* Excluding the Control Schools

** The numbers of students in these rows may be somewhat misleading because the two sub-tests would have been taken by more or less the same students.

combined lost ground. Students in all grades of school 7 showed progress, but the ones in all the three grades of school 1 lost ground in the said area. Students in the control schools did much better than the ones in the Title I schools in Mathematics Computation.

In the area of Mathematics Basic Concepts, on the whole, students in grades 4 and 5 made gains but the ones for grade 6 did not. With the exception of school 5, students in all schools made gains on the whole and the gains were the highest for the ones in school 1. Students in all grades of schools 1 and 3 made gains in the area of Mathematics Basic Concepts. Once again, the comparable group of students in the control schools did better than the ones in the Title schools although the differences are not as pronounced as the ones in the area of Mathematics Computation.

To sum up, the Title I mathematics program in the city seems to be the most effective at grade 5 level and least effective at grade 6. The program at school 3 produced the greatest gains and the one at school 5 was the least effective. Students in school 1 made notable progress in all grades in the area of Mathematics Basic Concepts but no progress was observed in any grade of the said school in the area of Mathematics Computation.

Conclusion: On the basis of the data in Table A and B, it is concluded that the students in all grades improved in the area of Reading, although the gains are considerably greater for grades 4 and 6 than the ones for grade 5. The students in some grades showed improvement in the area of Mathematics whereas, the ones in others lost ground. Students in schools 7, 3 and 1 gained the most in the area of Reading, Mathematics Computation and Mathematics Basic Concepts respectively. Overall, the students made greater gains in the area of Reading than in Mathematics.

Students in non-Title I control schools did as well in Reading as the ones in the Title I schools; however, the students in the control schools did much better in the area of Mathematics than the ones in the Title I schools.

FORMATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS

On the basis of the experience gained from this study, we feel that potentially helpful information and suggestions can be procured by a process evaluation of this type developed on an on-going basis and that constructive feedback for possible program changes can be initiated almost from the very first day, when participants begin to look at both their program and themselves in a kind of spontaneous self-evaluation. This potential to provide relatively quick evaluative feedback seems to be one of the strengths of this kind of evaluation. Such on-going formative results fell into three categories in this study: (1) the specific self-knowledge that became evident to Title I staff as they began examing themselves as a result of this formal evaluation; (2) the unearthing of inconsistencies and/or program or procedural misunderstandings that became apparent as staff members compared their programs with other in-system Title I activities through interaction with the evaluator and the central office and finally (3) those possibilities for program inprovement which sometimes came more quickly to the eyes of an impartial outside observer than to an involved program participant and which could often be implemented with little further analysis. And since one of the primary objectives of program evaluation is program improvement, the "results" of this process evaluation should eventually be measured by the extent to which information gathered and suggestions made are specifically helpful to the participants of the program.

There will now follow a description of the eleven areas to be studied in this evaluation.

A. Goals and Objectives

Findings:

What are the goals of the program, and are they clearly and consistently understood? The performance objectives of the Title I

program for grades 4, 5 and 6 are formally set forth on page six of the Portland School System's Application for E.S.E.A. Title I projects as follows: "Fifty percent (50%) of these students (those eligible for Title I services) will be expected to increase their reading, language arts and/or mathematics skills post test scores by six Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) points over their pre test scores with the addition of Title I corrective and remedial staff services as outlined in Section F. Performance gains will be measured by use of the norm or criterion referenced tests indicated in the evaluation section of this proposal." These NCE goals mentioned were established by the State of Maine, based on previous years state-wide evaluation results. Portland decision makers formally incorporated additional overall goals into their program application only to the extent that they were indirectly reflected in the job "Performance Objectives" of the Title I staff set forth in the body of that application and in Appendix C thereto.

The principals of all Title I schools were interviewed (Appendix A) and asked this question: "DOES YOUR TITLE I PROGRAM HAVE ITS OWN SET OF GOALS AND OBJECTIVES?" Five answered "No" - one answered "Yes". (One principal is responsible for two Title I schools). In the case of the principal answering "Yes", the goals of his school were set forth not in writing but were informal and were in his words of "long standing." (As a requirement of system policy, schools are not currently obliged to develop formal written goals.) In addition, there appeared to be no specific consensus on

general system-wide Title I goals among the principals, only an agreement that remediation in reading and mathematics is central to the program. Three principals mentioned the social and emotional well-being of their students as being an additional general goal, and one principal described program goals as being "indefinite," "too vague," and as "needing better articulation." Another administrator described the system's goal as being "ambiguous" and "poorly defined."

This same pattern of lack of specificity was reflected in the following staff and teacher interview responses describing Title I goals which ranged from, "I don't know" to "raise student's achievement to grade level in reading and mathematics" to raise achievement "one grade level" or "up to potential." One respondent thought it was to work "toward the development of the whole child." No one of the eight-four interviewed mentioned the NCE measurement criteria which had been included as part of the system's application in their comments on goals and objectives, and when the evaluator, on a limited and informal basis, specifically mentioned NCE's during a number of interviews, few respondents had any understanding of what their import was. One researcher says, To the extent analysis of data is done along formal lines, the principal may not even be able to comprehend the methods the evaluator uses to come to his conclusions. Such technical intimidation cannot cause him to react favorably. Most principals are trained by their experience to mistrust what they cannot understand. Talk of NCE's and multivariate regression is foreign to him. (Emphasis is the evaluator's). It does not appear to relate to more urgent problems: How can I improve teacher X's instruction?" (vander-Ploey, 1980).

In short it was found that there was a lack of consensus concerning specific goals and objectives that included all levels of teachers and staff. It was also found that no school had its own individual formally written goal statement and that there was a lack of understanding as to how program success would be judged. A review of a portion of the literature dealing with compensatory education bore out the "conventional wisdom" that well-defined goals and academic objectives clearly stated and understood are key ingredients of successful programs. [Sources include Rotberg & Hill (1976), Clark (1980), and National Institute of Education Study (1978]. Both educational research as well as practical operational considerations suggest that specific goals have a direct impact upon all of a program's characteristics, from measuring accountability, to determining student identification cut off points, to staff selection and distribution, to guiding instruction in the program. And if goals and objectives are vague or incompletely understood at various staff levels, it is to be anticipated that the program may be ill designed to meet the original intentions of the decision makers or be less than efficient in carrying out important objectives. Unfortunately, as stated earlier, the evaluator did not find clearly written and generally understood Title I objectives in the Portland Public Schools. However, there is obviously staff awareness of this limitation, for in answer to the question "WHAT SINGLE SUGGESTION DO YOU HAVE THAT WOULD IMPROVE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS", eight staff members spontaneously mentioned goal clarification (General Interview Form, Appendix D).

Suggestions:

1. That there be specific written goals and objectives established both on a system-wide and on a local school level.

2. That the goals be developed as carefully and with as much input from the total Title I constituency as is realistically possible with an understanding of the direct relationship that the resulting decisions will have upon program design. Thought should be given to increasing the input of the classroom teacher in these decisions. Could funds be budgeted to provide for an appropriate workshop to establish such goals and to include representatives from the various Title I constituencies in the decision-making process including the School Committee?

3. That the goals developed contain specific short and long term behavioral objectives so that they be kept constantly as an ongoing ingredient of daily operations.

4. That these goals be framed in language that is clear and meaningful to all concerned and which can be specifically related to Maine State Title I goals in understandable relationships, i.e., the meaning of NCE's as used in the State goal statement should be explained to those who will be expected to strive toward fulfilling those goals.

5. That these goals be communicated in an appropriate written form to all those who are accountable in the program and whose children participate in the program, preferably as the first item in a Title I Manual which will be mentioned later in this paper.

6. That these goals address in a comprehensive fashion those critical questions that must be decided before a thoughtful

comprehensive program can be developed. For instance:

a. What students are to be served by the program, the most educationally deprived or a larger less handicapped group?

b. What grade levels will be served? All levels? All levels with emphasis upon the primary, or the primary only? Should there be a concentration of resources or an equalization of them? (Goal articulation decisions should be made with the understanding that a program can't be all things to all people.)

c. What kind of emphasis should be given to new and innovative practices? (There is a tradition of innovation in the Portland system: PREP, the behavior modification oriented school and PRIME, the resource center, are examples of innovative programs that began originally as Title I activities only to become permanent system operations.)

d. Should almost exclusive attention be directed to remediation in reading or should a broader interpretation of "language arts" be considered as part of the Title I program?

B. In-Service Training

Findings:

When questioned as to who designs their schools' Title I in-service training program, (Appendix D) the principals responded as follows: "The consultants alone" - four schools, "the consultants in conjunction with the principal" - two schools. One principal indicated there was no in-service program currently in existence in his school. Of the sixty-nine non-administrative Title I staff members and classroom teachers interviewed, in

response to the question "HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY IN-SERVICE TRAINING DURING THE 1979-80 SCHOOL YEAR?", forty-seven (68%) of the respondents answered "Yes", twenty-two or (32%) answered "No." The distribution of responses by staff category was as follows:

	Yes	No
Aides and assistants	41%	59%
Teachers	76%	24%
Consultants	80%	20%
Social workers	100%	0%

Note that the aides indicated considerably less activity than the other staff. In interpreting these results, however, it should be noted that the definition used by the evaluator to denote in-service activities in compensatory education was broadly defined to include such involvement as "ECRI" workshops and meetings and consultations with the reading and mathematics consultants, much of which was informal. There appeared to have been an effort in the past years, at two schools using the ECRI method in reading (Schools #5 and #7) to see to it that aides attend the ECRI workshops. In a significant number of cases a "Yes" response reflected only one session, or minimal in-service training exposure. There was practically no evidence of any attempt to develop comprehensive school-wide Title I in-service training particularly aimed at compensatory education. See Appendix F for the distribution of in-service activities engaged in (Question #30 in the General Form) and note the sporadic nature of the majority of all in-service offerings. Since the type of in-service training most commonly cited by staff was consultation with the reading and mathematics consultants, it might be significant to note how much time the teachers and the

aides estimate they spend conferring with the consultants. (The nature of the social workers responsibility would require them to have little or no need for consultation of an in-service nature with the consultants. However, they do have frequent and apparently effective conferences with the teachers.) Later in this report, the Section, Impact upon the Classroom Teacher will deal with another aspect of the relationship between the teacher and the Title I program.

In response to the question aimed at determining how much time various staff members spent discussing Title I related problems with one another, approximately 75% of the teachers said that they spent at least one hour a week with the consultants as compared with only 40% of the aides who spent at least one hour. The aides spent less time with the mathematics consultants than with the reading consultants. (Appendix G.) Could this be because the reading consultants are more active in their work with the aides, that aides are less comfortable in the area of mathematics, or is it that the reading program has been a part of the Title I program for a longer period of time? On average, teachers in addition to meeting more frequently with the consultants than with the aides, also met for longer periods of time with the consultants. Mathematics and reading consultant responses to question 1D and 1E on their Specific Form (Appendix D) tend to substantiate the previous indications that consultants spend, on average, less time in a regular in-school work week with aides than with teachers. The estimated average of consultant time spent with the teachers was 9% as compared to an estimate of 6% with the aides.

This pattern in which aides receive less in-service training than other Title I staff is further reinforced by the response to

the question "HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY IN THE TITLE I PROGRAM?" Of the eight responses by consultants which could be considered to deal with in-service training, only one mentioned aides, while five dealt specifically with teachers. In answer to teachers Specific Form 1(e), "CONSULTANTS HELP YOU TO IMPROVE YOUR SKILLS IN WORKING WITH EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS," twenty-one teachers answered "Yes," five "No" and five qualified their answers. (In the future the Specific or General Form question number will be given only where necessary for the sake of clarity. Otherwise the question will be quoted as it exists in Appendix D.)

Finally, in answer to the question "WHAT KIND OF IN-SERVICE OFFERINGS ARE MOST HELPFUL TO YOU?", those items which were mentioned by respondents more than once are as follows: (the number in parenthesis indicates the frequency of response)

Teachers
a. Work with consultants rather than having workshops (7)
b. Learn about specific materials for underachievers (4)
c. Learn how to deal with disciplinary problems (3)
d. Learn of the background of the Title I program (2)

(One teacher indicated in-service was not needed and one indicated that in-service should be minimal.)

Aides
a. On-the-job training and learning by doing (4)
b. Formally structured Title I workshops (2)
c. Special Title I workshops during regular system-wide in-service days (2)
d. System-wide problem and idea sharing (2)
e. Orientation in expected duties for aides (2)

(Two aides felt that in-service was "a waste of time.")

Hill and Rotberg, (op. cit. page 9) comment upon in-service training as follows, "Analyses of the effectiveness of in-service training present the most consistent findings. Where successful programs are found, it is frequently reported that teachers were given in-service training at the beginning of the project, and that this training was directly relevant to the content of the instructional program. Both Coulson (1976) and Sweeney and Blaschke (1975) found that the more recent the in-service training, the more it showed relationship to program effectiveness. However, planned in-service must be good in-service since there is considerable skepticism among staff about the helpfulness of in-service training per se. On the other hand it is apparent that the clinical supervision program for social workers has been a successful addition and should be supported. All workshops, meetings, etc., should be as specifically directed toward professionally related concerns and as work-oriented as possible. In-service training should include as much regularly scheduled consultation (meeting time) with the reading consultants and mathematics consultants as is reasonable. The staff appears impatient with theoretical non-applicable training. It may be unrealistic, however, to expect that useful in-service training will spontaneously occur without some kind of thoughtful structured plan.

Suggestions:

1. Establish an "In-Service Title I Advisory Board" involving all members of the Title I team to plan a comprehensive in-service training program. The charge to the Board would be to emphasize the practical and specific skill areas involved in working in compensatory education for each staff designation. (This need to transmit information in a specific and non-written format will be

reinforced by the other findings later in this report.) The objective of the in-service program would be to make every Title I staff member a trained specialist in remediation and compensatory education in his or her staffing category. Since aides deliver most of the direct instruction in the Title I programs and, in terms of the minimum educational background required by their job description could usually be expected to have less professional training than other Title I staff, it would seem prudent to make provision so that aides have an opportunity to receive <u>at least as much</u> training as their colleagues. Wherever possible staff members inside the Portland Schools who have developed particularly effective methods and/or classroom techniques should be encouraged to share these exemplar approaches with their colleagues. Particular attention would be directed toward encouraging a feeling of community among the Title I staff and promoting the so-called "team approach" where applicable. For a listing of available resources in this area see Appendix H.

2. The advisory Board might consider these possibilities:

a. Offer a "paid for" pre-school multi-day orientation session for some or all Title I staff, where general information would be discussed concerning the Title I program and manuals distributed giving pertinent program information. After the general session, the staff could break down into groups or "teams" at which time experts in compensatory education might hold "hands-on" type workshops in particular skill training areas that "teach" the in-service participants by encouraging them to work in a simulated classroom environment utilizing the specific skills involved: it would be a kind of "learning by doing."

b. Schedule a special meeting time as part of the aides' and consultants' regular working week in each school to provide for at least weekly meetings so that consultations which are now often random will become more regular. (This specific scheduling is currently in place at one school and appears to be quite successful.)

c. Provide for a special Title I offering to be part of all regular system-wide in-service days with Title I funds provided, if necessary, to ensure that capable workshop leaders and materials are made available.

d. Ensure that all new staff are given formal instructions in their job responsibilities in the Title I program as well as general information concerning Title I guidelines before they begin their assignments. A Title I Manual mentioned earlier could be an effective instrument in assisting new personnel to understand these unfamiliar responsibilities.

e. Establish an informal in-service relationship with Special Education personnel in order that one program might draw upon the resources of the other in skill training and colleagual consultation in the various areas of instruction which the two programs have in common, i.e., remediation in reading and mathematics. This would reduce duplication of effort. The necessity of coordination with Special Education is stressed throughout this report.

f. Utilize parent conference time for in-service training for aides. (This provision is currently practiced in at least one school.)

g. Include aides in regular faculty meetings particularly those schools where Title I matters are discussed at such meetings.

(Aides are currently included at most schools.)

h. Invite teachers who have Title I students in their classes to join in applicable remedial in-service training, attempting to develop the "team approach" mentioned earlier. This could be particularly meaningful in schools where a physical "pull out" approach is not possible. Under present Title I organization a staff team approach is not only desirable, it would appear to be necessary if the program is to function effeciently.

C. Diagnostic Testing and Prescriptive Program Writing

Findings:

In answer to the question "IS EVERYONE BELOW THE 25TH PERCENTILE TESTED IN ADDITION TO THE REGULAR SCAT/STEP TESTING", five of the reading consultants answered "Yes", one "No", and one's answer was qualified (qualified by the fact that although there was a policy to test all such students, the students involved had not yet been tested, and the academic year was over half completed.) With mathematics consultants the pattern reversed itself with only two answering "Yes" compared to four "No's." (One school was in the process of appointing a new mathematics consultant). The most common testing instrument used by the reading consultants in this category is an informal reading inventory (IRI) which is by definition "informal" and neither uniformly structured nor consistent in format. However, a number of other tests were used, for example the Slosson Oral Reading, Kottmeyer Basic Goals in Spelling and end-of-book tests. The use of the previous year's reading groups as a kind of placement device and the Pupil Evaluation Team findings were also mentioned.

With the mathematics consultants there was no pattern of consistent diagnostic testing of Title I students other than the STEP test. Those that did test automatically, mentioned teacher made tests, Key Math and informal math inventories as instruments utilized. This indication that there was no uniform diagnostic testing policy was confirmed later in an interview with the Mathematics Director. It appears that current practices among the consultants vary widely as to which students are tested if testing is not done automatically. In answer to the question "WHO DECIDES WHO WILL BE TESTED?", the following were mentioned: consultants (6), the teachers (4), the parents (4), the principal (2), Pupil Evaluation Team (2). In short, there is neither consensus nor consistency as to who does decide. There is no automatic protocol.

There also appears to be no pattern among mathematics or reading consultants as to what testing procedures are used with students who transfer in during the school year, with responses ranging from "Students receive placement tests in their basal readers," to "Sometimes none," to "Records of the other school," to "Talks with consultants in the other school," to "Not automatic," to, "It would be nice if there were a regular screening test for new kids to 'resettle' them."

In answer to "DO YOU HAVE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR EACH TITLE I STUDENT?", two reading consultants answered "Yes" (one of these indicated that "objective-setting" was done orally with the teachers at the beginning of the year.) Two reading consultants answered "No" and two answered with reservations. The mathematics consultants answered, one "Yes," three "No," and two reservations. The reservations in both mathematics and reading mentioned the use of "cluster objectives," and "testing by groups informally," and

one reading consultant who had answered "No" mentioned she would like to but couldn't "because of practical considerations." The responses indicated a lack of consistency which is important since the consultants are the staff members most concerned with diagnostic and prescriptive work. However, despite the obvious lack of structural uniformity in the diagnostic and prescriptive practices in the schools, the evaluator often found that the consultants had a thorough knowledge of the academic abilities of the Title I students in his or her charge. In other words, lack of structure and uniformity does not necessarily mean lack of student information.

In the Consultants Specific Form (Appendix D) which seeks out in detail how much of the consultant's available time is spent on (a) diagnostic and (b) prescriptive work, the average for the mathematics consultants responding indicated that 15% of their time was spent on diagnostic work and an average of 7% spent in prescriptive work. The reading consultants average for diagnostic work was 26% with an average for prescriptive work of 17%. Note that in both categories diagnostic and prescriptive, the reading consultants estimated they spent considerably more time than the mathematics consultants which would appear to confirm our earlier findings that the reading consultants gave more emphasis to the testing of students below the 25th percentile. In answer to the question "DO CONSULTANTS PROVIDE YOU WITH SPECIALIZED ASSISTANCE IN MEETING THE INDIVIDUAL NEEDS OF PARTICULAR TITLE I STUDENTS, I.E., DIAGNOSTIC WORK UPS, IEP'S, ETC.?" (Teachers's Specific Form Appendix D), the teachers were unanimous in their response with 30 "Yes" and no "No's". The comments were consistently positive with only two critical observations confirming the

previous finding that some meetings between teachers and consultants are regularly scheduled but that a high percentage appear to be either random or "on request". Also the frequent mention of testing for "group location" bears out the frequent consultants' responses in which cluster grouping was mentioned. Finally, all the reading consultants and three out of the six of the mathematics consultants, spontaneously made some type of reference to diagnostic and prescriptive work in their description of what they considered to be their major responsibility in the Title I program.

The SCAT/STEP testing plays an important part in the testing pattern of the school system, and the evaluator was impressed at the urgency with which Title I staff mentioned the fact that last year (spring 1979) the testing results had been returned so late as to offer little assistance in diagnostic work. As a consequence, one consultant reported that it had been necessary for him to institute a separate, independent system for testing all Title I students because of the lateness of the SCAT/STEP returns. As will be seen later in the section on Uniformity, there is significant mobility within the system both of staff and of student population, and consistency in diagnostic approach and staff understanding of such key areas as diagnostic and prescriptive work could be critical to efficient program operation.

As was the case with both in-service training and goal setting, diagnosis and individual prescription are mentioned by Rotberg and Hill (op. cit. pg.9) as being of that small body of educational characteristics that have been found to be typical of exemplary educational programs.

The evaluator, "subjectively," suggests that the degree to which individualized diagnosis and the creation of individualized

student objectives can be effected is to a significant degree related to the number of students served. In other words, as the cut-off point is raised and more and more students are included in the program, it becomes increasingly difficult to provide each student individualization because of the finite nature of Title I resources available. This point was mentioned in the earlier Goals and Objectives section and will recur later in the Staffing Arrangements section. It would not seem to be reasonable to expect that student numbers can be expanded without having an adverse effect upon individual program. As a consequence, the frequency with which "cluster" and "group" objectives were mentioned by staff might be a reflection of the difficulty encountered when dealing with large numbers of students. Conversely, there may also be a certain minimum number of students who can be worked with efficiently from an organizational point of view and effort should be made to assign students so as to obtain maximum program effectiveness. Further study is suggested. One aspect of this complex relationship between the number of students served and test results is considered later in Section VI. In an attempt to determine whether a relationship exists between diagnostic prescriptive activity and the test performance of certain randomly selected students, a regression analysis study was undertaken. (See Appendix C for a description of the study.) The results did not indicate any relationship worth pursuing.

Suggestions:

1. That the Test Review Committee currently in existence in consultation with the Reading and Mathematics Directors select one diagnostic test in reading and one in mathematics to be given at the beginning of each academic year. Each Title I student

would be so tested. It might be advantageous if the test selected be so designed that written prescriptive educational programs in specific behavioral objectives addressing individual skill deficiencies could be easily developed from the diagnostic section of the test. Two of the tests which are designed in this format are the "Prescription Reading Inventory" and "Diagnostic Mathematics Inventory" of McGraw-Hill. Other testing instruments can be found in such sources as Tests in Print by Buros (1974) and Mental Measurement Yearbook by Buros (1978).

2. That these results (diagnostic and prescriptive) be entered into the students' folder, made available to the teachers and become a part of the "master Title I log" described later in the section on Communications.

3. That testing time be scheduled and the funds necessary for the purchase of such tests provided.

D. Student Identification

Findings;

School observations made during the first cycle discovered that there had been a breakdown in the application of the identification process and that at least four Title I schools initially identified some of their students incorrectly. Throughout the study the evaluator experienced difficulty determining the exact numerical make up of the students who were receiving Title I services. Part of this problem undoubtedly was attributable to one of three factors: the confusion concerning the initial identification process just mentioned, the nature of the student nomination process in effect this season, and the lack of uniformity in the record keeping process employed. This characteristic presented a major obstacle to the effectiveness of the process

evaluation and will be commented on later. In addition to this general inter-school misunderstanding of process, there was considerable confusion within the staff of most schools as to how the identification process was designed to work in that school. The procedure adopted by the school system provides that funds are divided among the various Title I schools on the basis of the number of students in each school who score below the 25th percentile in the reading and mathematics sub-tests of the STEP series. In this procedure, staff nomination of students for inclusion in the program does not play a part. Funding distribution is automatic and objective, dependent entirely upon the results of standardized test results. The nomination option made it possible during the 1979 school year for staff to add students under certain conditions to the eligible Title I list who did not fall under the 25th percentile cut-off. It had no effect upon the distribution of Title I funds.

Using General Form Questions #21-27, (Appendix D) the evaluator made a subjective judgment that thirty-two out of sixty-nine respondents did not understand the procedures. Thirty understood correctly while seven were vague in their response. The principals' descriptions of the nomination process in effect in their schools as indicated through their interview responses were not in complete agreement with coordinator Steven Adamowski's memo of October 1, 1979 (Appendix I) outlining identification procedures to be followed. The misunderstandings varied, with confusion ranging from who could nominate a student to who would approve such nomination. Only one principal opted not to use the "nomination" process at all. He indicated concern for the "danger of subjectivity it might entail". The evaluator also encountered general confusion as to the manner in

which students could be eligible for social workers' intervention. In summary, there was considerable misunderstanding at every staff level as to how the identification process was to be implemented this year.

In Table C that follows, Title I schools are shown on the basis of the percentage which each schools' Title I eligible population was reported to have changed during the 1979-1980 school year, using as a base figure the number of students who were originally identified at the beginning of the year compared to the number of students who were identified by the individual schools at the end of the year as having received services. The schools are ranked in descending order of percent of increase. It is assumed that the degree of change can be attributable either to additions made through the nomination process, to normal student population changes, or to the original misunderstanding concerning the initial student identification list. In order to obtain a perspective of the dimension of change that took place within the various schools Title I population during the 1979-1980 school year, a study was undertaken. Comparisons with test results are included later in the section on THE RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT TEST RESULTS TO PROGRAM VARIABLES. The evaluator was surprised to note the extreme differences from school to school in the fluctuation of students receiving Title I services which ranged from one school which actually reported a <u>decrease</u> of 14% from those students originally identified for that school to another school which reported an <u>increase</u> of over 100%. One wonders what impact such major shifts in the number of students served from what was originally anticipated had upon the program planned and whether such changes are helpful or harmful?

TABLE C

TITLE I POPULATION PERCENTAGE CHANGES 1979-80

School Number	Percent Population Change
7	+106
3	+ 82
2	+ 63
5	+ 21
1	+ 13
4 & 6 Combined	- 14

In the process of the interviewing, it was learned that, on occasion, a student for one reason or another will fail to take either the regular STEP tests or a make-up. This appears to be a very infrequent occurrence, but one which when it does happen will eliminate the student from initial Title I program eligibility.

Staff response to the question, "HOW CAN WE IMPROVE THE METHOD OF IDENTIFYING STUDENTS FOR TITLE I SERVICES" was varied, but consistent in that of all the respondents, only one indicated a preference for the use of testing exclusively. There were no comments unfavorable to the nomination process in theory, and despite the fact that many respondents, particularly teachers favored raising the 25th percentile up as high as the 35th percentile, there were no suggestions that the cut-off point should be lowered. The social workers were almost unanimously in favor of including students into the program on the basis of social need rather than

academic need only. This suggestion is contrary to Title I guidelines. Relatively few staff offered names of specific students who they thought had been misplaced by the identification process, apparently because in most instances students who were thought to be misplaced had been incorporated into the Title I program by the nomination process which was sometimes quite informal. Roberts and Tallmadge, (1976) say, "Title I personnel are often reluctant to base selection for program participation solely on achievement test scores since such scores are known to be imperfect indices of true achievement levels . . . Teacher judgments combined with test scores, however, should provide a more valid index of educational need than either measure taken separately."

Suggestions:

1. That any student who has failed to be tested in the regular SCAT/STEP cycle be automatically tested by the mathematics and reading consultants to determine if he qualifies for Title I services.

2. That a reliable system of communications and administrative checks be established between the various Title I schools and the Department of Research and Evaluation to reduce the possibility of misunderstandings concerning not only the initial roster of Title I eligible students but also the specific procedures which are to be followed concerning identification of those students who will be post tested as part of the Title I evaluation. Follow up should be rigorous to ensure that all applicable Title I students are post tested. This suggestion can not be stressed strenuously enough since the value of any evaluation will be only as reliable as the accuracy and uniformity of the pre and post testing data. The evaluator feels that weakness in this area has limited the effective-

ness of the study. This control should fit into an overall effort to clarify all Title I procedures as discussed in the Communications section of this report.

3. That the student identification process eventually decided upon, and the resulting parameters set to determine the size of the Title I student population be specifically based upon the goals set for the program. In short, the student identification process should limit the Title I population to those grades and that number which can be most efficiently served in terms of explicit program goals by the Title I resources available. This should not necessarily be interpreted to mean the fewer the number of students receiving Title I services the more effective the remediation will be, but rather that Title I staff should be selected and coordinated with the number of students to be served so as to achieve the most effective combination of students, staff, materials and space to achieve the stated goals of the program. Small is not necessarily beautiful.

4. The evaluator suggests that if an appropriate identification process as described later in this section is adopted, the need for the nomination process now in use would be eliminated except for unusual circumstances. He further suggests that any major addition of Title I students to the eligibility roster, especially if this be informally done, could adversely affect attempts to identify the program for reasons of compliance or evaluation. One of the basic guidelines governing Title I states that "Title I children receive an identifiable program." (Hill and Rotberg, 1976). However, if a nomination option of student identification is continued, explicit, uniform, detailed criteria should be established describing such details as: how a student will qualify for nomination, who can make such nomination, which staff members can approve, what basis

will determine approval, what limitations will be placed upon maximum and minimum numbers of students added, which staff will be responsible for updating lists of participating students, and finally what procedures will be used to determine the conditions under which a student will leave the program because of improved performance.

5. That the student identification process be based upon a combined composit score and not upon a single test. The following are two possible variations of the combined score technique currently in use in some school systems: a) A "Combination Approach" in which all students scoring below a certain percentile are automatically accepted in the program, say the 25th percentile. Then, other students who tested above the cut off, say between the 25th and the 40th percentile would be accepted if their classroom teachers rated them above a certain level on a specially designed rating form. b) A variation of this format is to develop a combined score (at least one standardized test in addition to the teacher rating score). The resulting combined scores could be ranked and a specific number of students selected. The SCAT and the STEP, or two consecutive STEP Tests, along with teacher rankings could also be used to yield a combined score that would require no additional testing time or expense.

E. Communications

Findings:

The previous sections, dealing with Goals and Objectives and the Student Identification Process, described certain weaknesses encountered in the Title I communication process. Many staff interviewed during the initial program design stage indicated the desire for more information and a general dissatisfaction with the overall

Title I information distribution process. Moreover, of the seventy respondents who answered the question "ARE COMMUNICATIONS WITH RESPECT TO TITLE I PROGRAMS, REGULATIONS, ETC. SATISFACTORY?", General Form (Appendix D) forty answered, "Yes," twenty-five, "No," and five offered qualified answers. The fact that a significant percent of those answering "Yes" (approximately 50%) had not appeared in the judgment of the evaluator to understand the student nomination process made it seem that even among those answering "Yes" that "communications were satisfactory to them," there were some for whom the communication process had not, been effective. This seems to represent an important breakdown in communications, particularly among teachers, since they were expected to participate in a student nomination process which some did not understand. The effectiveness of the identification model was, therefore. compromised. In addition, eight staff members interviewed, mentioned areas concerning better communications as their highest priority for program improvement. (This represents the fifth most frequently mentioned recommendation.)

The evaluator, in the interviewing process, came upon an area of interest which cannot be substantiated with "hard" data, but which in his subjective judgment, should be mentioned. This concern relates to the feeling on the part of some teachers, reflected in many schools, that special programs, not just Title I - as well as out-of-classroom demands were increasingly making instrusions upon the teachers' classroom time and effectiveness. (There was apparently a feeling that while some authority was being gradually taken away from them, the teacher's responsibility for the entire classroom remained). One teacher described himself as a "glorified receptionist" while another indicated that she was "always the last

to know" (about matters that affected her). Such comments were not numerous, but in the evaluator's opinion, occurred often enough to warrent comment in the Communications section. These feelings of concern on the part of some of the teachers that they are, losing control of their own classroom destiny may have significant implications.

Part of this feeling is perhaps precipitated by the national movement of school organizations toward more specialist and special program orientation, away from the historical self-contained classroom model where the teacher was in complete control. This recent development is not attributable to faulty communications nor can it be controlled. However, to the extent that teacher uneasiness springs from lack of information or misinformation about program specifics, and to the extent that teachers can be made more participating members of the Title I effort, to that extent the situation is worth examining. (This area of concern is commented on later in the section on Impact on the Classroom Teacher and the Evaluation of the Feasibility Study). There were, of course, a large number of teachers who indicated enthusiasm for the Title I program, and overall teacher response would certainly be described as supportive and positive.

In conclusion, the evaluator found that in order to secure information concerning the Title I program, a number of staff had often to be approached, i.e., the principal, the secretary, the consultants, etc. In no school was there one staff member assigned to be the custodian and central source of information.

Suggestions:

1. That a specific effort be made to ensure that the teacher be kept advised on a regular basis of any and all Title I activities which would in any way influence the children under the teachers'

charge whether the program be "pull out" or "main-streamed".

2. That there would be advantage if these communication efforts could be combined with special education activites of a similar nature so that the teacher will have to deal with one and not two separate entities. Any general effort on the part of the Title I organization or the District Advisory Councils to explain its operation and goals to the general public would also tend to make the teacher more knowledgeable. In addition, the various local parent advisory councils might consider ways in which they could keep the school faculty advised of their activities by such actions as including general faculty on the PAC Newsletter mailing list, inviting them to appropriate PAC meetings, and encouraging their input concerning educational priorities and/or Title I program planning.

3. Than an ongoing attempt be made to enlist suggestions for constructive change from parents and staff to reduce misunderstanding and clarify issues. A Title I Newsletter with a regular "Suggestion Corner" column might be helpful with participation by the Coordinator and the chairman of the District Parents Advisory Council. (Perhaps the Bulletin (Appendix J) begun as part of this process evaluation may be continued).

4. That certain minimal but critical information concerning all Title I qualifying students be kept and maintained on an ongoing basis, perhaps a kind of student "Log". This information, which would conform to the requirements of confidentiality, would allow appropriate staff members to obtain from <u>one</u> source pertinent data quickly and accurately concerning a Title I student's situation. Such a record might also make compliance a matter of ongoing concern to staff and more easily demonstrable to those

responsible for the program. This source could be one information list or a card file which might include the following information:

a) the monthly updated names of all Title I eligible students in that school, including notation if a student has progressed up and out of the program, and indicating which students have been added to the basic list, if the nomination process is part of the student identification procedure.

b) the kind of Title I services that each student was currently receiving, i.e., "none," "individual" or "Title I group tutoring by aide", "social worker intervention", etc.

c) a brief statement of objectives for that student.

d) the diagnostic test results for that student and;

e) the prescription established for that student. It has been previously noted that the detail in which such a system can be maintained is directly related to the size of the Title I population in relation to the staff and that the individualization that is possible with a 15th percentile cut off will not be feasible as the cut off point is lifted progressively higher up to say, even the 40th or 50th percentile. The completeness of the diagnostic detail obtained and recorded for each Title I student will be in direct relationship to the number of students for whom each staff member is responsible - but as was mentioned previously there may be a minimum number of Title I students below which staff loses its efficiency.

5. That a brief and succinct handbook be developed explaining the philosophy, funding and other pertinent details to be given out each year to Title I staff and PAC chairman. Certain questions which frequently recurred during the evaluator's interviews were addressed in the Evaluation Bulletin #2 (Appendix B).

F. Tables of Organization and Responsibility

Findings:

In this study the term "tables of organization" will refer to the system set up for the Title I staff which establishes who is responsible for, and has authority over each part of the program. In other words it answers the question "Who is in charge of what?" At four of the seven schools practically no "pull out" type instruction exists (Schools 1, 3, 5 and 7). In these schools, the aides report directly to the teacher and the consultants and social workers report to the principal or assistant principal. In non-pull out schools, the consultants generally supply diagnostic and prescriptive services as well as materials to the teacher who passes them on to the aide. During the class visitation this process was observed in action. In the three schools where pull-out and modified pull out type programs were observed, the aides were under the direction of the consultant, but at one of these three schools the aide indicated that it was not clear as to whether the consultant or the teacher was in charge. The relationship was not clear cut. (The past year, because of school closings and others dislocations, the official roster of aides was not completed until December, and even after that date, there was some confusion as to the type of funding source for certain aides) At that school, (#2) the aide worked in the classroom while the consultant pulled out students on a regular basis for direct instruction. It is interesting to note that although the sample is quite small, school #2 enjoyed the highest average NCE gain in both computations and concepts at the 6th grade level where the consultant worked directly with the students (Table #8).

Personal observation (subjective) on the part of the evaluation consultant indicated that at one of the so-called "pull out" schools, there had been some dissatisfaction on the part of one or two teachers, perhaps stemming from the fact that the consultant was in charge of an aide who was working in the classroom. Such occasional conflict is to be anticipated since historically the aides have worked more or less at the sole discretion of the classroom teacher, and the anticipated shifting of this responsibility to the consultants will change a tradition of long standing. During the interview cycle, a number of consultants spontaneously voiced their concern at having to be responsible for what amounts in some schools to a large number of Title I aides (one school currently has eighteen on staff).

The Title I Coordinator indicated that by the 1980-81 academic year all Title I aides will be under the control of the consultants. It is not clear, however, which consultant, mathematics or reading, will have the ultimate authority. Since such an arrangement is a departure from past practices and will necessitate new procedures, it is understandable that some staff may feel reservations and uneasiness about this new way of doing things. If control of a program is fragmented into many parts, the impact of the program may also become fragmented. If the Title I staff are to achieve a unique identity as a professional unit dedicated to a specialized team effort, uncertainty as to assignment and mid-season shifts of responsibility from "local" to flow through" to Title I programs can have a counter-productive and frustrating impact upon the program. (This is not to suggest that "mid-season" federal funds be rejected.)

Suggestions:

1. That every effort be made to firm up the roster of the Title I program, particularly the aides, before the beginning of the school year, and that transfer of aides from one category to another - i.e., Title I, "flow through" to "locally funded" be kept to a minimum in order that program identity and spirit can be encouraged.

2. That a special preschool orientation be conducted to include aides, consultants, and if possible teachers to prepare them for this new working relationship, and to attempt to develop a team approach. The teachers must be included in the team if it is to be an effective effort. The social workers should be kept advised of this new working relationship.

3. That <u>one person</u> be appointed by the principal as being responsible for that school's Title I program. This could be the principal himself, if he so chose, or as is the case with Special Education, a staff member appointed by the principal. Such action might clear up a possible table of organization ambiguity as to which consultant is in charge, reading or mathematics. This appointed staff member could also act as liaison with Special Education, he could handle those other miscellaneous matters which it has been observed frequently arise concerning the Title I program, and be able to address the communications problem posed earlier in this report. Because of the many areas in which Special Education and Title I have a similarity, the evaluator suggests that thought be given to having one person in each school coordinate both programs.

Other Table of Organization options available, besides principal appointment would be for the Title I Coordinator to

establish a system-wide protocol in which one particular Title I staffing category bears this responsiblity in each and every school. (This staff would be under the principals' direction, of course.) Possible nominations could be either the mathematics consultant, the social worker or the reading consultant, or that individual already appointed to be in charge of Special Education. If the explicit Title I manual already recommended is drawn up clarifying Title I procedures, guidelines, etc., the responsibilities of that single person in charge could be substantially reduced since many of those problems now created because of personnel misunderstandings alone would possibly be eliminated were staff to better understand job description and Title I guidelines.

4. That a physical pull out program seems to be more adaptable structurally than an in-class operation for a Table of Organization in which the consultant is in charge, since in a "pull out" arrangement both aides and students are physically removed from direct classroom control and would possibly "fit" more naturally under the supervision of a consultant who would then not be constantly required to "invade" the classroom teacher's area of responsibility in order to oversee the remedial operation. Educationally, however, the merits of a "pull out" verses a non pull out program are extremely controversial (See the section on Instructional Programs), and if a pull-out program is not considered desirable, then coordination within a conventional classroom program could be improved if regularly scheduled conference times be established. In that way aides and consultants can meet together out of the classroom when other demands and distractions do not occupy them. The arrangement currently utilized at one school through which the period 8:00-8:30 a.m. is set aside

each day for this purpose appears to work satisfactorily. It is suggested that the ideal organizational set-up be one in which the "remediation team" i.e. the consultant, the aide, the classroom teacher and the Special Education teacher all meet together. However, since scheduling problems would tend to make such arrangements extremely difficult on a regular basis, monthly or even once-a-semester progress meetings in classes with high Title I student populations might have merit.

5. Finally, there would appear to be advantage in appointing one staff member to be responsible for the overall system-wide Title I program, particularly in areas involving compliance. Funding obviously presents a problem. The State disallows such expenditures on administration, but it is possible that an arrangement could be made by utilizing a regular member of the school system staff. Compliance supervision alone could conceivably be accomplished on a two or three days a month assignment once full compliance has been instituted, controls made more automatic, and record keeping has been standardized.

G. Uniformity and Consistency

Findings:

There was found to be general conformity throughout the Title I program in a number of general areas. All schools seek to remediate Title I students in reading and mathematics; all schools utilize the same staffing categories to effect this remediation i.e., all employ at least on a part-time basis, a reading consultant, a mathematics consultant, a social worker and aides and assistants. All schools utilize a basic 25th percentile cut-off point on the STEP test results for student identification, and six out of seven schools combine the said cut off point with some variation

of the nomination process. All schools spend the major percentage of their Title I funds for personnel almost to the complete exclusion of other expenses.

However, there is lack of uniformity in the following areas which have or will be discussed in the appropriate sections of this report: 1) Coordination with Special Education Services; 2) Aides Assignment Procedure; 3) Diagnostic Testing Practices: 4) Student Selection Processes; 5) Method of remediation instruction (parallel or individual student skill deficient oriented) 8) Table of organization (who gives aides their instructions?); 9) In-service programs: 10) Progress toward complete compliance; 11) Grade level emphasis for instructional concentration; 12) Staffing Patterns.

The differences between schools in staffing patterns as indicated in staff-student ratios were, of course, altered slightly by the addition of new funding during the course of the study (Appendix E). The pattern noted later in the Section on "Staffing" for the larger schools to place more emphasis upon direct instructional personnel (aides) was actually reinforced when two small schools decided to commit their money to a summer program rather than to more staff, while another small school spent part of its additional funding on materials. One middle sized school, however, did shift its emphasis to direct instruction by adding four aides to its program. This pattern has been perpetuated into the Title I budget proposal for 1980-81 which reflects a large school emphasis upon commitment to aides (described in Section VI).

There is also very little uniformity evident in the selection of text books used in reading and mathematics on a class-by-class horizontal basis from school to school; although, in general, schools do individually tend to standardize on a particular

text book series within their general curriculum (See Instructional Programs). Decisions concerning text books do affect the Title I population but are not considered part of this study since their use applies to all students in the school. The evaluator, moreover, found no identifiable, planned uniformity in either general instructional technique or materials used in any system-wide effort to standardize tutorial work and compensatory education. Uniformity is a two-edged sword and in areas where it does not appear to be warranted, it can represent an unwelcome and threatening possibility to the concept of local autonomy. The evaluator (subjectively) sensed this feeling while speaking with some Title I staff and PAC members.

In the meetings of the local and the district parent advisory councils which the evaluator attended in addition to numerous meetings held with principals, it was evident that strong local school loyalities and identification existed.

There is, however, a relatively high mobility rate within the school system, particularly in the Title I schools, and high student mobility, in some ways, argues for uniformity. The movement of both staff and students was particularly active last year and will be high whenever schools are closed or attendance lines changed. This is a tendency which was observed on a number of occasions. While the evaluator was engaged in classroom observations or interviews, he became aware of situations where students were either transferring in or out of that school and provisions were being made by staff to accommodate the student into the new program. Although often this transfer was being pursued conscientiously by school personnel, in most instances inquiry revealed that there was no standard procedure to facilitate such transfer. Heavy

student transfer from one year to the next can be an important factor in a school's educational life, and a number of principals mentioned this as a problem in their schools. Figures describing the turnover of Title I students are not available. However, total student transfers within the Title I schools studied varied from a low of 7% for the school year 78-79 at School #3 to a high of 29% in the same year at School #1. In general the larger schools experienced a higher percentage change in population than the smaller schools. This could suggest that the larger schools need to make special provision to ensure that the educational program of transferring students is disrupted as little as possible.

On the other hand interviews disclosed that the staff of all the Title I schools were "veteran", having served at the same school for at least two years, with the exception of one school which because of its conversion that year from a Junior High to an elementary school obviously contained a completely new staff. Due to the same rationale, the students at that school would have had no prior experience in that particular Title I program. One other school, was in its first year as a Title I school. Both its faculty and students would, therefore, have had no experience in the school's Title I program. Any impact that the degree of staffing and student continuity may have upon program effectiveness will be discussed in the section on RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT TESTING RESULTS TO PROGRAM VARIABLES.

One other manifestation of a lack of uniformity became evident at the beginning of the program design phase of the study when group interviews with various staff members, particularly aides, indicated some dissatisfaction caused by a belief that working conditions, particularly of non instructional staff, varied widely

from school to school and were occasionally, therefore, unfair. (This could also be a communications problem). During the time the study was in progress, the Coordinator instituted many changes, the results of which would tend to make the system more uniform. Since these changes were of an on going nature, were not in place at the beginning of the evaluation, and were made intermittently right up to the ending of school, they will not be commented on here but should be examined in the coming academic year if any kind of process evaluation instrument is continued.

Suggestions:

Since consideration of uniformity and consistency between schools involves all major areas of program, some suggestions made as part of other sections are repeated here.

1. That all schools meet identical criteria of Title I compliance.

2. That all schools observe standard diagnostic procedures for Title I students as well as similar student identification practices, and comparable staff working conditions and in-service training structures. These areas have been previously mentioned in detail in appropriate sections.

3. That coordination between Title I and Special Education is extremely desirable since many students are served by both programs. (A study determining just how many students are, in fact, involved with both programs should be helpful). At the moment such coordination is often carried out in an informal and ad hoc manner in the affected schools, and the recommendation made as suggestion #3 in the section on Organization and Responsibility would be applicable here. It would not appear to be realistic to attempt to consider one program without considering the other. As a consequence, the

evaluator suggests that, unless there is such specific and close coordination throughout the school system any evaluation of the impact of the Title I program upon students or of the degree of its compliance will be difficult. The two programs would appear to be too interrelated to be considered separately, and uniformity in the handling of both programs should prove helpful.

4. That one person be appointed by the principal in each school to be responsible for the daily operation and compliance of the Title I program.

5. That basic updated record-keeping instruments be kept in each school to record the status of each Title I student.

6. That one staff member in each school be assigned the responsibility of seeing that the transfer of information and records involving Title I students, especially having to do with any recent diagnostic testing or prescriptive academic program, be carried out as quickly and comprehensively as possible. Such a staff member (the social worker might be a natural choice) would act as an ombudsman for Title I students in transit. The "ombudsman" from the sending school would contact the "ombudsman" in the receiving school either by phone or through whatever combination of informal or formal memorandum-type format is judged to be most effective. A method will need to be developed by which the sending school "ombudsman" is notified of all his or her school's Title I student transfers before they take place.

7. That regular student transfer card be amended to identify a transferring student as having been eligible for Title I services at the sending school.

8. That policies be developed to detail the manner in which a student may become eligible for Title I services who has transferred

into the Portland school system during the school year from another system or has transferred from a non-Title I school to a Title I school.

9. That a study be considered for the 1980-81 academic year to consider the impact which administrative leadership has upon program characteristic and student testing gains. One of the controlling influences that effect school differences - non uniformity - is this leadership component. Such a study has not been possible in this evaluation. Since all but two of the seven schools studied will have new principals in the 1980-81 school year, there will be an opportunity to observe the change in program which is effected if any, by such realignment.

H. Staffing Arrangements and Personnel Scheduling Practices

Findings:

The Title I programs in the Portland elementary schools are almost exclusively personnel oriented with only 3/10 of a percent of the original 79-80 budget allocated for supplies and materials (no appreciable change is reflected in the 80-81 budget). No separate and distinct instructional methods, materials or programs are offered in the various programs except at two small schools where physical pull-out programs are offered. In addition all schools utilize identical staffing categories: reading and mathematics consultants, social workers and aides. (The 7th and 8th grade Title I programs - not included in this report - employ reading teachers, and one elementary school added a reading teacher to its staff late in the past academic year.)

Because of this exclusive budgetary emphasis upon staff and the uniformity of staffing categories employed, the major observable

difference that the evaluator found between the various school programs consisted of the manner in which each school utilized and proportioned its staff i.e. which staff category is given numerical and budgetary priority, how is this staff category assigned so as to deliver services to the Title I eligible student, to whom is staff responsible, from whom do staff (aids in most cases) receive instructional materials, where do the aids perform their duties (in the classroom or out), what priority do the social workers and consultants give to various ingredients of their job descriptions, and finally how do all Title I staff receive their in service work in compensatory education? Table D page 57 describes a number of these characteristics for the seven schools under consideration, and may be of help in providing the reader an overview of the distribution of staff in relation to the number of students served in mathematics and reading. The information that is presented reflects staff "in place" at the beginning of the evaluation in late January, 1980. It is important to recall that considerable changes in staffing were made from time to time throughout the year (Appendix E) and that further adjustments are planned for the coming year's budgetary requests. All staff time has been estimated by the evaluator to reflect approximate time devoted to the intermediate grades only at that school by the staff member involved. This was particularly difficult to approximate at schools #4 and #6 combined because of a revolving door technique in use whereby students received services for various periods of time till particular skill deficits were corrected. This table also takes no account of instances where locally funded aides perform duties with Title I students similar to those performed by the regular Title I aides.

TABLE D

TITLE I STAFFING INFORMATION PRORATED FOR GRADES 4, 5, AND 6, AS OF 2/1/1980

School	Title I Math Students Served	Title I Reading Students Served	Total Title I Students Served	#of Reading Consultants	RC Student Ratio**	# of Math Consultants	MC Student Ratio	Social Workers	SW Student Ratio	# of Aides Assistants	Aide Student Ratio	Total Title I Staff	Total Title I Population (K-6)*	Combined student staff Ratio
5	138	132	151	1	132	1	138	1/2	302	5	30	7-1/2	373	20
1	51	63	63	1/2	126	1/4	204	1/2	126	5	13	6-1/4	265	10
7	64	83	101	8/10	104	2/5	160	1/2	202	4-1/2	22	6-1/5	233	16
4 & 6	24	12	31	1/2	24	1/2	48	1	31	1	31	3	184	10
3	44	30	51	1/2	60	1/4	176	1/2	102	1/4	204	1	137	51
2	25	11	31	1/4	44	4/5	31	1/2	62	1/3	93	1-5/6	74	17

* Schools are arranged on the basis of their Title I population (K-6) from the largest to the smallest.

** The "student ratios" reflect the total number of Title I eligible students for whom one full time staff member in that category is responsible. It could be called that consultant's or social worker's "Load." For example, at School #5 there are 132 students who received services in reading in the intermediate grades, and two reading consultants were available to cover grades K-6; therefore, on a prorated basis one reading consultant is responsible for approximately 132 students in grades 4 - 6 only. For purposes of this table the ratio - in this instance 1-132 will be expressed as a single number i.e. "132."

C2

C1

Figures which are used reflect information furnished by the schools to indicate students who actually received services. In the case of schools #4 and #6 reading and mathematics and school #1 in mathematics only, there is a discrepancy between these figures and the numbers of students tested for the model A analysis. This difference is possibly attributable to the initial confusion on the part of these schools as to the identification process.

In Table E page 59, the following results appear to be of importance.

1. In general the larger schools (Title I population over 200) gave more emphasis to direct instructional personnel, aides and assistants and had a relatively low aide-student ratio.

2. With few exception the smaller schools (Title I populations below 200) placed more emphasis upon the supportive staff: consultants and social workers and maintained lower staff student ratios.

3. Note the extreme differences between staff-student ratios evidenced at the various schools i.e. with social workers it ranges from 31 to 302, with aides from 13 to 204. This major disparity in staff assignment would suggest that there would be corresponding differences in program or in the job descriptions of the various staff categories. One would expect that if staff had been assigned to implement a particular "designed" program this would have been the case. The evaluator in his interviews and class observations found little evidence of such programatic differences, on the contrary, there was considerable similarity of program between schools.

In order to determine which school places greater emphasis upon direct instructional staff, Table E page 59 was developed. It presents the percent of total instructional salary committed to

TABLE E

SCHOOL BUDGETS COMMITTED TO VARIOUS STAFF CATEGORIES.
RANKED FROM HIGHEST TO LOWEST PERCENTAGE OF AIDE SALARIES.*

School	Staff Category	Number of Staff Equivalents	Prorated Money Spent	Percent of Total Personnel Budget
1	Reading Consultant	1/2	10,193	19
	Math Consultant	1/4	3,690	7
	Social Worker	1/2	8,729	16
	Aides	5	30,755	58
			53,367	
7	Reading Consultant	8/10	16,308	28
	Math Consultant	4/10	5,904	11
	Social Worker	1/2	8,729	15
	Aides	4½	27,680	47
			58,621	
5	Reading Consultant	1	20,386	28
	Math Consultant	1	14,762	20
	Social Worker	1/2	8,729	12
	Aides	5	30,755	40
			74,632	
4 & 6 Combined	Reading Consultant	1/2	10,194	25
	Math Consultant	1/2	7,380	18
	Social Worker	1	17,458	42
	Aides	1	6,151	15
			41,183	
2	Reading Consultant	1/4	5,097	18
	Math Consultant	4/5	11,809	43
	Social Worker	1/2	8,729	32
	Aides	1/3	2,050	7
			27,685	
3	Reading Consultant	1/2	10,193	42
	Math Consultant	1/4	3,690	15
	Social Worker	1/2	8,729	36
	Aides	1/4	1,537	7
			24,149	

*This table presents all reading consultants on the basis of their being Title I funded. As of January 1980 one reading consultant for each area was taken over by local funding.

various staff categories Grades 4 5 and 6 and is based on average Title I staff salaries. (In order to avoid inequities, it is system policy that the budget of each Title I school is charged on the basis of average salaries for all Title I staff and not on the basis of the actual salaries of the particular staff members employed at that school. The schools have been ranked from top to bottom beginning with the school which spends the largest dollar percentage of its budget on aides and assistants (direct instructional staff.)

In all of the data presented so far, it may be of interest to note that despite the extremely wide swings in all the staffing ranges, there has been one consistency among schools in staffing assignment in that a social worker was assigned to each Title I school area irrespective of the number of Title I students involved. Considering the picture which the tables have presented the evaluator wonders if the decision makers decided to construct the resulting staffing relationships on the basis of purely thoughtful, planned educational grounds or whether other considerations played a role. In an attempt to determine whether or not a relationship exists between the number of hours of direct instruction in reading and mathematics available in each school and test results, observations were made during the various classroom observations. However, the large number of variables encountered make direct comparison unreliable and they have not been included. For example, Title I students in most all schools are exposed to direct instruction in a variety of ways other than through Title I services alone i.e. foster grandparents, volunteers, locally funded aides (in some schools an extremely important component). But most critical of all, special education teachers, who

concentrate in the same areas of instruction as does Title I particularly reading instruction, provide remediation to an important percentage of the Title I population. This variety of influences which affect the Title I student but which are by their nature difficult to quantify make meaningful evaluation difficult. In addition as was mentioned earlier, considerable staff changes were made during the course of this study which would tend to influence test results. The preceeding observations and data have been concerned with the distribution of staff between various schools at the intermediate grades. The priority given by the principal within a school between the intermediate and the primary is discussed in the section on Distribution of Title I Services. A description of the professional work performed by the staff is treated in the section on Instructional Programs. Perhaps the most critical ingredient of the entire Title I program is the decision making process through which the staffing commitments for each school is arrived at, for without exception these staffing ratios will determine the nature of the program.

Portland's Title I decision makers have recently been engaged in a kind of transition, moving away from the practices of earlier years when the Parent Advisory Council apparently had less impact upon decision making than the professional administrative staff. Current inclinations tend to place more emphasis upon the role of the PAC in this partnership. This shift may be due, in part, to federal recommendations that parents be given an important part in the advisory process.

The relationship of any purely advisory body to an executive staff and school committee can present ambiguities and potential

difficulties; to a certain extent the degree in which this relationship is effective, efficient and harmonious can influence the success of a Title I program. For that reason it is vital that the nature of this decision making relationship be made as clear as possible to all participants, particularly the implications which staffing decision will have for programs and the interrelationship which exist between program goals and objectives. (In his interviews, the evaluator found that there was uncertainty among some of the Title I community as to the exact nature of the decision making process, and the evaluator "heard" on numerous occasions that there had been an occasion in the past when PAC recommendations had been overruled in such a fashion as to cause concern to the Title I community.)

Finally, in-school observation indicated relatively wide variation as to the nature of the non-instructional assignment of staff, particularly among the aides. This was the cause of certain discontent on the part of some aides (evidenced in the interview process) who felt that they were being asked to perform more non-instructional duties than similar aides at other Title I schools.

Suggestions:

That if a school's Title I program is not separate and easily definable from the regular program as is often the case at present, an attempt be made to effect this through some of the following procedures.

1. Design every staffing decision as a specific outgrowth of a program goal to assist in planning, implementing and evaluating programs.

2. Specify anticipated ideal staff student ratios in every staff category necessary to accomplish anticipated goals, and then

make staffing commitments as much as possible in accordance with the projected number of Title I students per grade level to be served. In this way the number of staff and the nature and priorities of their responsibilities will constitute the foundation of the program, and staff will know more precisely what is expected of them. As a result there would be a real motivation to distribute Title I students more appropriately from class to class. (Program compliance and evaluation will continue to be difficult as long as program is not more specifically and objectively described). Compiling information in a format similar to that used in Table D might be helpful in the planning process.

3. Guidelines can be drawn up by staff describing student staff ratios that might be reasonable at the various staffing levels to effect certain goals. These could be made available to planners as they design programs. In this way staff planning may be made in as objective rationale fashion as possible; this might tend to establish a common denominator between the District Advisory Council, Title I staff members, and The School Committee.

4. Specific parameters should be determined as to the nature of non-instructional duties. This will tend to accomplish a number of objectives: a) ensure compliance b) reduce inter-school jealousies and c) ensure that maximum time is assigned to specific academic duties including regular consultation periods between Title I staff and teachers.

5. In order that the Title I records which have already been described in the section on Communications, be as accurate as possible, it might be valuable to incorporate in those records notation of those other significant non Title I personnel who are working with a particular student (described earlier in this section.)

The total staff impacting upon a student should be considered when planning a Title I students' program.

6. Any evaluation of the effectiveness of either the Title I or the special education program should take into consideration the combined impact of both programs. In like manner where locally funded aides are used to perform duties similar to their Title I counterparts, this input must be evaluated in the light of student test gains.

I. Instructional Programs

Findings:

The elements of the Title I instructional program mentioned in this part of the study are the audio-visual supplies and instructional materials used, the teaching techniques and location of instruction, and the basic text books selected for the regular course of study. Diagnostic work, in-service training and experience of staff and, the hours scheduled for instruction in reading and in math have already been covered in other appropriate sections.

Classroom observation and interviews indicated that the materials utilized in remedial instruction are generally either the regular materials employed by all lower group students or those individually designed by the aide, teacher or consultant to meet a particular timely classroom need. In most all instances observed this "need" was to reinforce some basic skill that paralleled classroom instruction except at two schools using the so called pull out, or modified pull out method, where the consultants provided materials that were for the most part separate from regular classroom instruction. In no school did the evaluator observe the use of particular specialized remediation material that he understood had been obtained solely for use by the Title I Program. Only 3/10 of a percent of the

original 1979-80 budget was allocated for supplies and materials and no appreciable change is reflected in the 1980-81 budget despite the fact that 10 of those Title I staff members interviewed felt that materials in compensatory remediation would help to improve program. In a majority of the classes visited, basal readers were used rather regularly as instructional materials for Title I students by the aides, and these texts were at a lower reading level than those used by the main stream of the class. These regular texts utilized in both reading and mathematics by the normal school curriculum often played a considerable role in Title I instruction but have not been included in this study since their effects are generalized throughout the entire student population and can not be identified as a separate Title I influence. The ECRI method of direct instruction is utilized in a number of Title I classrooms, and where utilized for Title I remedial groups offers a very definite alternative to the traditional instructional methods employed for many Title I groups (this influence will be discussed in the RELATIONSHIP SECTION.) Two schools visited, #5 and #7, appeared, in the opinion of the evaluator, to have incorporated the ECRI method to a greater degree in its original (non-modified) state than other schools using various manifestations of the methods. The principals of these 2 schools when interviewed also spontaneously indicated that they had attempted to see that all aides in their schools received instruction in the ECRI method.

The evaluator encountered no special use of audio visual equipment for Title I students except at School #1 where the controlled reader was used extensively in the 4th grade. This confirms the almost complete absence of budgetary commitment for such expenditures. In only one of the schools was a physical pull-out

program practiced in both reading and mathematics (School #6) although a modified pull-out program was attempted at School #2 in mathematics. In most schools the aides worked in the regular classroom often at a small table at the back and sometimes moved from desk to desk in assisting students or met with small groups of students in a circle of chairs often at the back of the room. This traditional reading circle was in marked contrast to the ECRI groups observed with their emphasis upon direct continual student participation and high "time on task." At School #2 the math consultant pulled out a group of 6th grade students for remediation in mathematics; both mathematics concepts and computations. This is of particular interest to the evaluator since it was the only practice observed where a consultant worked in a concentrated regular fashion with a group of Title I students although a math workshop was initiated at School #3 too late in the year to have been expected to have had observable results.

Another characteristic of the pull-out programs, appears to be the tendency, when students are physically removed from the classroom, for the consultant rather than the teacher to control the aide's academic activities. As a result, the evaluator felt that the nature of remediation is less apt to be tied to the day-to-day progress of the regular classroom; remediation becomes more oriented toward independent diagnostic evaluations of particular students' needs. The problems involved in the transition from a teacher controlled aide structure to a consultant dominated situation was discussed in the section on Tables of Organization and Responsibility.

A study of the manner in which consultants and social workers proportioned their average work week indicated a few interesting

patterns particularly with the consultants. This information was obtained in the interview cycle using the "Specific Form for Reading and Mathematics Consultants." (Appendix D) The accuracy of these projections was partially and informally substantiated by school visits and classroom observations (See Table F page 68).

Note that in Schools #1, #2 and #3, mathematics consultants indicated involvement with tutoring, but that no reading consultants were so engaged. In addition three mathematics consultants as compared with one reading consultant mentioned demonstration leasons as being part of their responsibilities. Could it be that the math consultants having more recently emerged from the classroom were more inclined to re-enter the classroom to tutor and give demonstration lessons? On the other hand note that the reading consultants as a whole were more active with the classroom teachers both in consultation and in in-service work and spent more time in diagnostic and prescriptive work.

With the exceptions noted, there is surprising uniformity between schools in the distribution of professional time spent on various tasks particularly in view of the wide differences of staff-student ratios commented upon in the section on "Staffing Patterns".

In an examination of the average group size used for Title I remediation purposes drawn from class observations, no pattern could be identified among the various schools except that, on the average, math groupings tended to be slightly larger than reading. There was as much variation within schools between various teachers as there was between schools. This data was obtained through interviews with the aides and informally confirmed by classroom observation.

TABLE F

SUMMARY OF THE PERCENT OF TIME CONSULTANTS ESTIMATE THEY SPEND ON VARIOUS TASKS DURING AN AVERAGE WEEK.

	READING						MATH						AVERAGE	
	(Schools)						(Schools)							
Activity	#5	#3	#2	#7	#4 & #6	#1	#5	#3	#2	#7	#4 & #6	#1	Reading	Math
a) Diagnostic work	20	15	25	35	15	15	15	5	5	30	10	20	21	14
b) Creating IEP's	10	15	-	35	25	25	10	0	7	10	15	20	18	10
c) Tutoring	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	70	55	0	-	50	0	29
d) Giving in-service training - Teachers	10	10	15	10	30	30	10	5	6	2 1/2	-	-	18	4
e) Giving in-service training and supervising aides/assistants	5	2	10	-	5	2	5	5	6	2 1/2	20	-	4	6
f) Selecting and procuring materials	10	10	5	5	5	8	15	10	8	5	5	5	7	8
g) Consulting with classroom teacher	40	40	15	10	20	20	20	5	-	25	15	5	24	12
h) Consulting with social worker	1	2	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	2	0
i) Other*	5**	10	20	5	-	-	25	-	-	25	35	-	7	14

* Mentioned in the "other" category in reading: 1. "Consulting with other staff"; 2. "Demo-lessons, meeting with salesman Principal, Parents, city-wide duties"; and 3. "Organization Planning". In math teaching special and demonstration lessons were mentioned three times.

** Numbers in various columns do not always add up to 100 due to rounding errors.

Attempts to identify patterns for social worker activity proved to be extremely difficult and further study in the future might be constructive. No patterns could be identified by comparing the various schools' responses to the "Social Worker Specific Form" (Appendix D), although as was to be anticipated the social workers at the larger schools dealt with proportionally larger numbers of students than the smaller schools. However, the difference in the distribution of time alloted to various tasks which might be expected between the large and small schools did not materialize. It may be that the social worker form was not designed carefully enough to accurately record these differences since a number of social workers found it difficult to respond to the form without combining a number of categories. This tended to make their responses less comparable with those of their colleagues.

Almost without exception the social workers interviewed voiced their strong feeling that any student in a Title I school in need of social worker services should be served. (This is contrary to Title I guidelines.) The evaluator observed confusion in a number of schools as to which students were eligible for their services. Such ambiguity should be cleared up if intelligent decisions are to be made about case load and job description.

Suggestions:

1. In the Portland Title I program, aides and consultants form a team along with the teacher in which the aide is the direct instructional arm, and in most instances the human contact between the program and the student. It might, therefore, be well to consider them as a kind of unit when making staffing decisions and to consider them as being directly related to one another in the implementation of particular programs. This will become more and more pertinent as consultants assume additional responsibility for the aide's work assignment. For that reason, in matters

concerning program implementation, it would not appear wise to assign one without regard for the other. For example, in schools which place emphasis upon the primary and have shifted aides into the primary, the effectiveness of the consultant, in the intermediate, can be adversely affected with no staff under his or her control to implement diagnostic and prescriptive decisions. As consultants now function, performing little direct instruction themselves, it would seem that they must be given enough implementing staff or change their own procedures and become more directly involved in direct instruction.

2. A survey should be made of special remediation materials specially designed for compensatory education or steps taken to develop such materials within the system. There are a number of possible advantages to the use of such materials. It could help differentiate Title I programs from regular class activities. It might result in the use of materials more specifically designed for the remediation task at hand, and it could free staff time now spent in the preparation of such materials for more individualization of student programs.

3. Since the existing programs were, for the most part, often difficult to differentiate from the instruction that might be offered to regular lower groups in the standard non Title I classroom, there might be merit in examining other exemplar programs which utilize separate and discrete approaches to compensatory education. One possible approach would be to organize a separate program or school consisting exclusively of Title I students which would attempt to maximize all the influences which experience has indicated have the most beneficial effect upon the remedial student.

4. Since staff-student ratios vary so excessively from school to school, professional discussions might be held under the auspices of the coordinator to discuss the percentage of time that might be appropriate to spend in different areas of professional concern to coincide with the intent (goals) of the particular instructional plan in place. For example if in-service training of aides and teachers is a high priority item one year, then, those professionals involved might be gathered together in order that there be mutual understanding of time priorities, and less is left either to chance or to the individual interpretation of any particular staff member.

5. Since this study has been unsuccessful in establishing measurable relationships between the academic program and the intervention of the social worker, it is suggested that a further study be considered in which the following areas are examined in terms of the relationship with social worker interaction: student self image, student's feelings about school, student's behavioral characteristics in class, and student's attendance patterns.

J. Impact of Title I Program Upon the Classroom Teacher

Findings:

Although teachers in this school system are not considered to be regular Title I employees, it can be argued that they exert more influence upon the learning outcomes of the Title I students in their classes than do any of the regular Title I staff, if for no other reason than the larger number of instructional hours that they spend in interaction with these students. Since they are, in fact, such pivotal members of the compensatory education team, an appraisal of their reaction to and participation in the program is critical information. The section on In-Service Training indicates that teachers do receive a considerable amount of assistance

in developing their skills in remediation (approximately 75% of the teachers questioned indicated that they received at least some training). It is interesting that the most common mode of such in-service involves consultation with the reading and mathematics consultants and that the consultants themselves estimate that they spend, on average, 9% of their time engaged in such teacher oriented work. In addition, 75% of the responding teachers indicate that they are involved at least one hour each week in discussions with the consultants. By every indicator studied in that section the teachers were found to be more involved with in-service work than were the regular Title I funded aides. The interaction between the teachers and the Title I program and its staff are obviously of importance in this area.

The section on Communications addresses the problem voiced by some teachers who feel fragmented by the interruptions occasionally caused by the Title I program. In the Evaluation section of this report there will be noted certain critical philosophical questions which teachers raised in response to the evaluative questionnaire concerning the fundamental purposes of the Title I program. It may be of importance that although the number of teachers who made such comments is relatively small, approximately 15%, such spontaneously negative comments are generally not to be found in any of the other staffing categories. Suggestions toward addressing this situation are made in this report particularly in the Communications section.

In order to gather additional information concerning teachers' reaction, a questionnaire was designed (Appendix K). As was previously noted, when teachers had the opportunity to express their feelings in written form as they were in question #5 of this questionnaire their reactions were substantially positive. Question #5 asks, "WOULD YOU BRIEFLY BUT SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES EITHER POSITIVE OR

NEGATIVE THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN YOUR CLASSROOM AS A RESULT OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM." There were such comments as, "By servicing the special needs of the Title I children, the program has allowed the smooth operation of the total Language arts and math curriculum," and "As a result of the Title I program everyone in our program has benefited ...." However, there recurs again and again that minority theme of fragmentation and discontent noted earlier and evidenced in such comments as "Most of the children being served by Title I can not effectively handle the seeing of several different adults each week"; one teacher describes the changes that have taken place in his classroom as a result of the Title I program, as being "Constant disruption and confusion".

Reaction to questions 1-4 of the said questionnaire on the part of the teachers as a group is reflected in summation in Table G page 74 which catalogues the reaction of 22 intermediate teachers who have Title I students in their classrooms. There were twenty-three respondents out of twenty-seven questionnaires sent out. (One response was returned blank). Only twenty-seven teachers were contacted since the remaining intermediate Title I teachers had already been interviewed earlier in the program. Their response will be compared later in this section. Two schools provided no responses since the two faculty members canvassed in one school did not return the questionnaire despite a second personal request on the part of the evaluator, and the teacher in the other school reported no Title I students. Various aspects of the impact of Title I can be seen in the variety of responses to the questions posed in Table G.

TABLE G

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF
RESPONDENTS TO VARIOUS QUESTIONS

Question 1. In your opinion the overall impact of the Title I program upon the children in your class has been:

Response	Number	Percent
a) Extremely positive	6	27
b) Positive	12	55
c) Not noticeable	3	14
d) Negative	1	5

Question 2. To what extent have your responsibilities and problems been taken into account while designing and implemending the Title I program?

Response	Number	Percent
a) To the maximum degree	2	9
b) As effectively as could be expected	7	32
c) Not as effectively as could be expected	9	41
d) Has not been taken into account	4	18

Question 3. To what extent have your responsibilities been taken into account while designing and implementing the Title I program?

Response	Number	Percent
a) To the maximum degree	1	5
b) As effectively as could be expected	9	41
c) Not as effectively as could be expected	10	45
d) Has not been taken into account	2	9

Note that 82% evidenced a favorable reaction (responses "a" plus "b") to Question 1 which involved an evaluation of the Title I program's impact upon the children in the teachers' classrooms and not an appraisal of the impact upon the teacher herself. This convincingly positive response however, was followed by a relatively negative orientation of teacher responses to Questions #2 and #3 with 59% and 54%, respectively, indicating less than positive attitudes

concerning the teachers' own relationship to the Title I program, (responses c plus d) Is this a reflection of the same discontent commented on in the Communication Section? Does this mean that teachers visualize the children as deriving more benefits from the program than the faculty or that they wish to be more involved?

Table H presents the degree of positive responses registered to Question 1, 2 and 3, broken down by school on the Teachers Impact Questionnaire where the larger number represents a more positive response. Schools have been ranked from top to bottom from more positive to less positive reaction. For purposes of arriving at a weighting, the most positive response, category "a", has been given a value of four, a response to category "b" has been assigned three, category "c" a two, and category "d" (the least positive response) has been assigned a one.

TABLE H

WEIGHTED AVERAGES OF RESPONSES
OF TEACHERS TO THE TITLE I PROGRAM

School #	Number of Responses	Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Total
5	6	3.33	2.33	3.00	3.05
7	4	3.75	2.25	2.50	2.83
3	5	2.40	2.40	2.20	2.33
1	4	3.00	1.75	2.00	2.25
2	3	2.67	1.17	2.33	2.22
4 & 6	-	--	--	--	--
Total		3.05	2.32	2.41	2.59

Although the number of responses is admittedly small it is interesting to note that the two schools with most positive responses fall into the "large" category while in general the smaller schools registered less enthusiastic response.

In order to determine teacher's reactions to specific services provided them by Title I, Table offers a summary of responses expressed in percent to Question #4 "IN WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS HAS THE TITLE I PROGRAM AND ITS STAFF HAD A SIGNIFICANT INFLUENCE UPON YOU?"

TABLE I

IMPACT OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM ON THE TEACHER: QUESTION #4

PERCENTAGE		
Yes	No	
42	48	a) "In improving those teacher skills which are required to work with the under achieving students...."
70	30	b) "In providing you with good diagnostic and prescriptive information....."
57	43	c) "In giving you a better understanding of the general Title I program".
71	29	d) "In supplying you or your aide with appropriate remedial materials....."

When comparing responses to Question #4, it is interesting to note that, in general, the teachers reacted positively to the specific assistance which the Title I program has provided them. Designers of the Title I in-service program should note, however, the relatively negative response to statement a). Does this mean that teachers already feel competent in compensatory education skills and therefore need no help or that the in-service training offered them by Title I has been poor?

Table J indicates the percentage of teachers who registered positive responses to each of the 4 sections of Question 4 broken down by individual school. Note the continuation of the general tendency indicated in Table H , in which the larger schools appeared in this small sample to register more positive responses than the smaller schools.

TABLE J

POSITIVE RESPONSE TO QUESTION 4
OF THE IMPACT QUESTIONNAIRE

Schools	Improves teachers skills in remediation	Provides good diagnostic and prescriptive information	Gives better understanding of overall Title I program	Supplies aide with appropriate remedial materials	Average
5	80%	100%	100%	83%	91%
7	50	75	25	100	63
1	33	66	50	66	54
2	0	66	50	66	45
3	20	40	40	40	35
4 & 6	no data	no data	no data	no data	-

Note in Table J that schools #1, #5 and #7 present the highest average response "picture" and that, in general, the respondents from these three large schools were more positive in every one of the four categories than the other schools. This pattern is quite similar to that one observed in TABLE H.

Other data addressing the same areas of concern were gathered earlier in the study when a separate group of 30 intermediate teachers was interviewed. Their responses to three questions on "Teacher Specific Form" (Appendix D) appear to reinforce this same pattern. This series of questions asked whether certain specific Title I staff services (those of social workers, aides and consultants) were helpful to the teacher. The three large schools #1, #5 and #7 with higher Title I populations, had completely favorable faculty response while the only negative reactions received came from the four other and smaller schools, Schools #2, #3, #4 and #6. Could this mean that Title I programs need to involved a certain minimum number of students and staff before they become effective, or that the teachers' more positive response

to the Title I programs in the larger schools springs from the fact that teachers working in schools containing higher Title I populations in these schools have more contact with the program through the aides and gain more personal classroom advantage from these same Title I aides? Could it be that larger schools, in general, have numerically more economically disadvantaged students and that there is a more sympathetic understanding on the part of faculty of the necessity for such a program because in those schools such students are more the rule than the exception? Or, finally, does it mean that are responses are too small to be significant?

Suggestions:

1. Suggestions 1-4 included in the Communications section are applicable to the concerns voiced in this section but will not be repeated here.

2. Since there are some faculty members who apparently feel more comfortable working in compensatory education than others just as on the secondary level there are some teachers whose skills and backgrounds seem to predispose them more for basic skill work than advanced - placement - type courses, there may be merit in attempting to identify such teachers and scheduling them for classes with high percentages of Title I students. The typical 4th to 5th grade or 5th to 6th grade split might be a more appropriate placement for teachers who for whatever reason do not feel comfortable in the program since the tendency in such split grades seems to be either to eliminate or greatly reduce the number of under-achieving students.

3. Another approach to this situation is to design separate and discrete courses exclusively for Title I students ("pull-out" or "tracking" type programs) where every aspect of the program is specially designed to address the Title I student. This possibility was mentioned earlier. Such classes could be led by faculty whose philosophy, background and skill development are predisposed to such compensatory education. A progromatic

change of this nature even one involving only a small pilot model is obviously a major departure from existing practice and the considerations enumerated above concerning teachers would represent only a small part of the factors involved in the decisions necessary to implement such a program.

K. Distribution of Title I Services

Findings:

It is difficult in any Title I program that nominally covers both the primary and the intermediate grades to accurately estimate the exact distribution of instructional services in that school. For although the assignment of aides is generally highly structured and can be accurately determined, the proportion of time spent by the principal, the social worker and the consultants from class to class, tends to vary throughout the school year and is often a subjective determination on the part of staff depending upon the needs of any one particular school day.

Although in general it was found that few Title I staff members were specifically instructed to give fixed time priority to the primary years, individual conferences with the staff disclosed that the nature of the early school years often placed larger demands upon staff time than was the case as students progressed through the school grades. It was apparent in school visits that in many schools the forementioned "facts of life" resulted in a defacto priority being placed upon the primary years which persevered until students overcame the adjustments both social and academic which are typically a part of the primary years and lasted until an adequate diagnostic history was built up for each student. Since there is apparently some interest among Title I decision makers in the possibility of concentrating more and more Title I services in the primary years, it might be well to devote a specific study to those years since this evaluation dealt exclusively with the intermediate and therefore, could view the primary only obliquely.

Taking into account the limitations outlined above, the distribution of Title I services in terms of staff assignment is presented in Table K which shows the distribution of aides between the primary and the intermediate and indicate where the principals and the reading and mathematics consultants feel the instructional emphasis lies.

TABLE K

NUMBERS OF AIDES ASSIGNED TO SCHOOLS AND
STATED PRIORITIES OF PRINCIPALS AND CONSULTANTS

	# of Aides Assigned to		Stated Priority		
School	Primary grades	Intermediate grades*	Principal	Consultants Math	Reading
School #5	4	5	e	e	e
School #7	9	9	e	e	e
School #3	1 3/4	1/4	P	e	P
School #2	2	1/3	P	e**	P
School #4	1 1/2	None	P	e	e
School #6***	1	1	P	e	e
School #1	6	3	P	e	e

* The entries in these columns indicate where these staff members felt emphasis was placed. P indicated primary, e indicated an equal distribution. Note that no staff member or principal felt that emphasis was upon the intermediate.

** Because of the lack of sufficient number of aides, the math consultants spends time in the intermediate grades involved in direct instruction.

*** Although at this school there seemed to be no official quota, the evaluator discovered in his visits that at that time more students were being covered from the primary than the intermediate.

From the information above it would appear that three schools 2, 3 and 4 appear to place emphasis upon the primary. (This picture, however, is extenuated by the fact that in all three instances other staff members have been utilized to partially replace the Title I aides who have been assigned to the primary.) Two other schools place some

emphasis upon the primary but the emphasis appears to be relatively modest. It is apparent that when aides are shifted from the intermediate to the primary the role of the consultant who operates in the intermediate with no, or a reduced, instructional arm is changed dramatically. It is interesting to note that in general the larger schools tended toward a more even distribution of aides and that conversely the smaller schools appeared to emphasize the primary. School observations disclosed that in all three schools with emphasis upon the primary, Title I services alone were apparently not adequate to satisfactorily cover the intermediate grades with compensatory educational services; however, since that time additional aides have been added which would hopefully correct this situation.

Suggestions:

1. Institute a study to compare the effectiveness of the primary and intermediate Title I programs. Such a study should also include a survey of the literature to determine the most appropriate age level in compensatory education to correct basic skill deficits.

2. Because of the relatively small numbers of Title I students currently at some grade levels, any effort to concentrate Title I services should take into consideration the optimum number of students that are to be served, particularly by the non-instructional staff, and the STEP cut off point (currently at the 25th percentile) should be appropriately adjusted.

RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT TEST RESULTS TO PROGRAM DIFFERENCES

One of the objectives of this feasibility study is to identify program differences (patterns), if any, which can be connected with Title I student test gains in reading and mathematics. This attempt to relate summative evaluation (test results) with process evaluation (program patterns) proved to be extremely difficult.

In this section, the term "pattern" will be used to signify that program difference encountered in the process part of the evaluation that might be connected with test results. For example, some schools "pull out" their Title I students, others "main stream" them. These would represent two different "patterns" of instruction.

The approaches used to identify these idiosyncratic differences as well as the problems encountered in the search for them are set forth in the following section in the hope that they may prove helpful to others attempting to establish relationships in their own schools. Fore-warned may be fore-armed! The PROCEDURE Section described how eleven areas were selected to be the focus of the process evaluation. Once established these eleven categories also became the areas examined in the attempt to establish these possible process-product relationships.

As was to be expected many of the potential relationships which were originally considered had to be eventually discarded because of difficulties in the following categories:

1. The pattern did not remain constant throughout the life of the study. (For example, students and/or staff may have been added to the program after the investigation had begun)

2. The pattern was not consistently implemented within one school or even within one grade. (For example, a "locally funded" aide might work with a number of Title 1 students in one class while a Title 1 aide worked with other Title 1 students in another class at the same grade level).

3. The pattern would be found to affect not Title 1 students alone, but all members of that class. (For example, a special course which emphasized reading in the content area was offered by one school to all its students in addition to regular reading time.

But perhaps most troublesome of all was the fact that the number of Title 1 students served fluctuated throughout the life of the study because of the nature of the nomination process or due to misunderstandings as to the identification process. This difficulty in dealing with an unstable population presented problems in most all areas where a relationship of process to product was sought.

It is true that some of the problems encountered were peculiar to the nature of the Portland Public Schools at this particular moment. (Described previously in Section III.) And such difficulties will no doubt be eliminated as the program becomes more stabilized in the next school year. Other difficulties, however, would appear to be common to <u>all systems</u> and for that reason should receive special attention in this report. For instance, it is to be anticipated that all institutions will change in varying degrees during a period of time and that unexpected change, by nature, can be neither predicted nor controlled. (For this reason, Section VIII stresses the necessity of flexibility in the design of a process evaluation). It is true that the examination of a "pull-out" type program will encounter fewer problems than the

"main-streamed" model common in Portland, since patterns can more easily be isolated, identified and controlled in this type program. From the point of view of the ease and accuracy of evaluation alone, of course, the most effective model would appear to be the one in which Title 1 students are permanently removed from the regular classroom and incorporated into a separate "Title 1 School." This arrangement would only be feasible under very special conditions.

However, in any program in which students remain as part of the regular classroom course of study, there will be a multitude of factors working upon the Title 1 student which originate from non-Title 1 sources. A case in point would occur if the principal were creative and utilized every resource at his command to improve instruction to all those whom he feels need remediation; he may utilize the so-called "holistic" approach found in a number of Portland schools which brings a whole variety of non-Title 1 resource people to bear on certain Title 1 Students, i.e. foster grandparents, volunteer tutors, student tutors, locally funded aides and most critical of all, special education staff. In view of the fact that special education (a program of comparable size to that of Title 1) can "legally" work with a student up to 50% of that Title 1 student's instructional day, would argue that any evaluation, process or product, of that student's progress must take into consideration the commonality of influences which are at work.

In short, the evaluator feels that the future effectiveness of the process-product evaluation model will be strongly influenced by the success with which the evaluator is able to identify and isolate those patterns which are directly applicable to Title 1 influences and those which are not.

He suggests that one of the shortcomings of this study was the limited degree to which such influences could be isolated, and recommends that future investigation be undertaken in an effort to develop specific procedures through which this process may become more accurately and routinely accomplished.

In the context of this concern for future evaluations, the experience of this study indicated that some patterns will tend to influence both reading and mathematics achievement in similar fashion. Differences in the effectiveness of a school's Title 1 Communication Network and the impact which the Title 1 Program has upon the classroom teacher are examples of such general influences. To address this characteristic it is suggested that future evaluators consider deriving a "total NCE" score for each school. This would combine the scores of reading, mathematics concepts and mathematics computations, and could be used to gauge general "cause-effect" relationships. Because of the limitations of time, such an approach was not utilized in this evaluation.

In view of the foregoing problems and other difficulties mentioned in the LIMITATIONS section, it is felt that any relationships derived from this study should only be treated as bases for further study. Due to the same reasons, we are commenting only on those relationships which in our judgement appear to be reasonably obvious outcomes of the data collected. Later, subject to the availability of funds, additional time will be devoted to further examination of the process product relationships.

Within this context and utilizing the original eleven areas as a structure, the following results are offered. General information set forth in the body of this report will be considered to be an understood background setting for this section and will not be repeated here.

For the convenience of the reader, Tables L and M on pages 87 and 88 have been included which show the rankings in declining order of the test results of the participating schools in Reading and Mathematics (Table L); further breakdown by grade has been provided in Table M. Examination of these tables points out two interesting general relationships: First of all, School 7 leads all other schools in the reading category with an average gain for grades 4, 5 and 6 of 7.82, a gain which is much greater than the average recorded by the other schools. In addition, School 7 stands first in NCE reading gains at all three grade levels, again by a comfortable margin. The evaluator feels that because of this consistent record of accomplishment in reading, particular attention might well be directed to any special characteristics of this school's program which are identifiable.

Next, the rather wide disparity between the average NCE gains in combined mathematics (1.636) and reading (4.869) registered for all schools appears to warrant comment (Tables A and B on pages 13 and 15), for faced with this relatively wide difference there is a natural inclination to try to identify program differences which might explain such a disparity. For example: Table F page 68 reveals that reading consultants on average commit considerably more time to diagnostic and prescriptive work than do the mathematics consultants; whereas the mathematics consultants are more active in the classroom performing demonstration lessons or giving direct tutorial assistance. Could these differences explain the test results? Are they critical patterns? The evaluator believes not, for further investigation demonstrated that there was such a variety of other influences at work in this area that no single factor appeared to be of sufficient importance to be singled out as a prime cause of the effect.

TABLE L

RANKING OF TITLE I SCHOOLS ON THE BASIS OF STUDENT NCE GAINS IN READING AND MATHEMATICS.*

MATHEMATICS

Mathematics Computation			Mathematics Basic Concepts			Mathematics Combined		
School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain
3	38	5.947	1	68	4.338	3	79	5.038
2	24	4.000	3	41	4.195	7	132	3.068
7	67	3.746	4/6	35	3.314	2	48	2.688
4/6	29	-0.240	7	65	2.369	4/6	64	1.703
4	133	-0.000	2	24	1.375	1	136	1.059
1	68	-2.221	1	128	-0.055	5	261	-0.027

READING

School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain
7	78	7.820
5	124	4.435
1	63	4.254
3	33	3.636
4/6	26	1.768

*School #2 has not been represented in the reading tabulations, and Schools #4 and #6 have been combined in Reading and Math because of the small number of responses.

TABLE M

RANKING OF TITLE I SCHOOLS BY GRADE ON THE BASIS OF STUDENT NCE GAINS IN READING AND MATHEMATICS. *

MATHEMATICS COMPUTATION

Grade 4			Grade 5			Grade 6		
School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain
3	17	7.294	2	5	10.000	2	10	5.300
7	18	.722	3	14	7,429	7	26	2.923
4/6	11	.091	7	23	7.043	3	7	-0.286
2	9	-0.778	5	52	4.115	5	40	-1.425
5	41	-3.829	4/6	7	2.858	4/6	11	-2.364
1	13	-4.538	1	31	-0.968	1	24	-2.583

MATHEMATICS BASIC CONCEPTS

Grade 4			Grade 5			Grade 6		
School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain
1	13	7.000	4/6	11	6.818	2	10	5.300
3	19	5.000	7	22	5.591	1	24	4.583
7	18	3.944	3	14	4.643	4/6	14	2.714
2	9	2.667	1	31	3.032	3	8	1.500
5	40	2.600	5	50	1.320	7	25	-1.600
4/6	10	.300	2	5	-8.800	5	38	-4.658

READING

Grade 4			Grade 5			Grade 6		
School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain	School Number	# of Stud.	NCE Gain
7	25	9.280	7	27	5.259	7	26	9.077
5	48	7.333	3	9	2.444	1	20	6.700
1	19	5.632	1	24	1.125	4/6	11	6.000
3	19	4.474	5	36	-0.583	5	40	5.475
4/6	7	1.286	4/6	8	-3.625	3	5	2.600

*School #4 had no returns for Grade 5.

For example: a) Five of six principals interviewed indicated that they give emphasis in their schools to reading instruction (comments like: "My school is a reading-oriented school," were common); b) the language arts almost universally receive larger blocks of time in the schools; innovative literature and reading-in-the-content-area courses are common; c) as was discussed in the In Service section, many aides appear to be more "at home" in the field of reading instruction than in mathematics, and d) reading consultants have a longer history of being members of the Title I "team" than the mathematics consultants. In short, this multitude of variables active upon one outcome are typical of the phenomenon commented upon earlier in this section where so many forces are at work within a program that the isolation of a singular cause-effect relationship involves more sophisticated approaches than were available in this study.

Were there, on the other hand, any differences which did appear to have singular impact upon test results? Let us examine the eleven areas.

A. Goals and Objectives

Because there was no single school or group of schools which had well-articulated, specific Title I goals generally understood, no relationship was found in this area.

B. In-Service Training

Although there was a considerable quantity of general in-service exposure among the Title I schools, the majority of such training was of an intermittent, occasional variety. No school or group of schools was found to offer an independently structured Title I program of such a nature as to be distinguishable from the school system's regular in-service program. The ECRI workshops offered an exception to this general characteristic and will be commented on later in this section.

C. Diagnostic Testing and Prescriptive Program Writing

A random sample of Title 1 Students was drawn in an attempt to discover whether a relationship existed between the test results of these students and the diagnostic and prescriptive service provided by the reading consultants and mathematics consultants. The results (Appendix C) did not indicate evidence of any connection of sufficient importance to warrant inclusion in this study.

This lack of apparent relationship was reinforced when the evaluator compared the amount of time consultants estimate they spend on diagnostic and prescriptive work with NCE Rankings (Table F, Page 68, responses A & B). As a matter of fact, the mathematics consultant from the school with the highest NCE gains in mathematics combined (School #3) indicated that she spent less time in this area than did the consultants in all the other schools.

D. Student Identification

The misunderstanding in this area on the part of at least four schools again makes the establishing of relationships difficult. However, the evaluator felt that despite this ambiguity, a connection might exist between the changes in Title I student population that took place during the year and eventual test results.

Toward this end, Table C on page 3[illegible] was utilized adding additional columns to reflect NCE rankings (Table N).

TABLE N

TITLE I POPULATION PERCENTAGE CHANGES COMPARED WITH NCE RANKING IN READING AND MATHEMATICS

School Number	Percent Population Change	Math NCE Rank*	Reading NCE Rank*
7	+106	2	1
3	+ 82	1	4
2	+ 63	3	**
5	+ 21	6	2
1	+ 13	5	3
4 & 6 Combined	- 14	4	5

* NCE Rank arranged from high (1) to low (5 or 6)

** Test sample too small to be included.

The results documented in Table N present a picture that is surprising to the evaluator, since a reverse relationship is suggested to the one that had been anticipated. In mathematics, for example, the first three schools whose population had increased a minimum of 50%, (#2, #3 and #7) achieved better test results than the four schools which registered smaller increases or even a decrease. In reading, the situation shows no pronounced relationship except that the school with the highest NCE gain sustained the largest population increase. (School #7)

The evaluator suggests that no relationships can prudently be developed in this section but that a review be made of the Title I literature to determine what, if any, findings have been made in this area.

E. Communications

In general the Title I communication process was found to be so lacking in structure that no school or group of schools could be found to provide an exemplar relationship that might be expected to affect test results.

F. Tables of Organization and Responsibility

This topic will be covered in the Instructional Program section.

G. Uniformity and Consistency

The eclectic nature of this category dictates that it can most effectively be treated in the many other sections which deal in particular with the program ingredients that constitute uniformity or the lack thereof. By its very nature it is made up by a combination of the other 10 areas.

H. Staffing Arrangements and Personnel Scheduling Practices

In order to determine if any cause-effect relationships exist in this area, certain information was extracted from Tables D and E pages 57 and 59 and combined in Table O which follows:

TABLE O

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN RATIOS AND PERCENT

OF BUDGET COMMITTED TO AIDE'S SALARIES

AND TEST RESULTS IN READING AND MATHEMATICS

School	RC Student Ratio	MC Student Ratio	SW Student Ratio	Aide-Student Ratio	Combined Ratio	Aides' % of Budget*	NCE Rank Math	NCE Rank Reading
1	126	204	126	13	10	58	5	3
7	104	160	202	22	16	47	2	1
5	132	138	302	30	20	40	6	2
4 & 6	24	48	31	31	10	15	4	5
3	60	176	102	102	51	7	1	4
2	44	31	62	93	17	7	3	**

* Schools ranked in the order of the percent of instructional budget committed to aides' salaries.

** Not included due to insufficient sample size.

The information set forth in Table O was collected in the hope that it might prove helpful to the evaluator in the discovery of relationships of staffing patterns to test results, but with the realization that it might be confusing to the reader. For a wide spectrum of data must be collected and analyzed even if a great portion of it will eventually be discarded when no relationship is established. For example, it was hoped that the combined student/staff ratio might be critical because of its indication of the intensity of Title I services available at a particular school. No relationship, however, was uncovered and as a matter of fact, the school with the highest gains in combined mathematics registered the largest (least intensive) ratio.

There does, however, appear to be a relationship between reading gains and those schools which make relatively large budgetary commitments to direct instructional aides. Schools 1, 5 and 7 spend a considerably higher percentage of their funds in this area than do the other Title I schools. (It is interesting to note that these schools also have the three largest Title I populations).

As is to be expected, there is a tendency on the part of the other schools - 2, 3, 4 and 6 combined, who committed less of their budget on instructional aides, to spend higher percentages of <u>their</u> budgets for social workers and consultants. This tendency is reflected in the comparatively lower consultant student ratios in effect in their schools. (Table D)

No similar relationship between budgetary emphasis upon aides and test results, however, exists in the area of mathematics. This lack of a demonstrated relationship may be the result of staffing situations current in a number of schools where personnel other than Title I aides provide direct instruction to Title I students. In some schools mathematics consultants provide such services and in other schools non-Title I aides do so. These practices tend to cloud the issue and make any attempt to relate test outcomes to the intervention of Title I aides, alone, extremely precarious.

The evaluator also attempted to establish a relationship between NCE gains and the manner in which aides are assigned to students. No relationships whatsoever were established. In fact, of the three schools which recorded the highest gains in all three academic areas, each school utilized a method of assignment distinctly different from the other two. The general method of assignment of Title I aides to grades and classes differed considerably throughout the system. The method utilized by school 7 was, however, singular in that all Title I aides were assigned as a group working in both the intermediate and primary, and were scheduled in such a structured pattern that the amount of time proportioned to reading and mathematics was regulated so as to achieve maximum core time. This schedule apparently was designed at some inconvenience to other programs because of the lack of flexibility it necessitated.

This method of scheduling coupled with the emphasis placed by schools 1, 5 and 7 upon aides does suggest to the evaluator relationships with reading test gains which should be further studied.

I. Instructional Programs

Classroom visitation disclosed no relationship between the use of special remediation materials and test gains. Since only 3/10ths of 1% of the total Title I budget was scheduled for materials, none was anticipated.

Three Schools offered pull-out or modified pull-out programs (schools #2, #4 and #6 combined). No relationship could be drawn between these schools and NCE gains in mathematics (combined). This result is not surprising, however, since "Evidence relevant to the debate ("Pullout" vs. "Mainstream" remediation) is sparse and inconclusive. Actual comparison of achievement gains in main stream and pull out situations are extremely hard to find." (Hill and Rotberg, 1976 P. IV 8), and it should be noted that . . . "Title I does not require or encourage either pull out or inclass programs." (N.I.E., 1978)

The question of whether the ECRI method of direct instruction is superior to the traditional manner of instruction is a controversial one in the schools. And because of the

irregular and inconsistent manner in which the ECRI system is utilized throughout the Portland Schools, any concrete association of its use and test gains is not warranted. It is interesting to note, however, that two of the three schools which achieved highest test gains in reading to a considerable degree utilized this method (schools 5 and 7). It is the subjective "hunch" of the evaluator as the result of classroom observations, that such a highly structured method of instruction may be positively associated with test gains in reading.

J. Impact of Title I Program Upon the Classroom Teacher

Any evaluation of teacher reaction is apt to be highly subjective and the limited number of respondents answering the "Impact" questionnaire was too small to be at all conclusive. Moreover, the findings reported in Section IV J which would suggest a possible relationship between a more positive teacher attitude toward the Title I program and the larger schools would be extremely difficult to associate with test gains since the classroom teacher's impact upon the direct instructional component of Title I remediation is an oblique one.

K. Distribution of Title I Services

As was discussed earlier in this report, Table K page 80, some schools, at least "on paper", place emphasis upon the primary grades. This pattern, however, may be invalidated by the fact that in many instances other resources are introduced to replace the Title I staff shifted to the primary, making the final educational impact impossible to determine.

In conclusion, a wide variety of possible relationships were considered by the evaluator in the course of this study - many of which because of time limitations have not been mentioned here. The relationship of reading gains to the amount of direct instruction made available, the manner of scheduling aides as practiced at school 7 and the use of the ECRI method in the very subjective opinion of the evaluator seem to be of sufficient dimension to warrant further study. In addition, the lack of any apparent connection between the pull out programs and test results would argue against moving too swiftly in that direction without further investigation especially if local principals are predisposed toward incorporating their Title I programs in the regular classroom.

Finally the evaluator was surprised to note that at least in reading the large schools performed particularly well. This result runs counter to the expectation occasionally heard during evaluation interviews that larger schools, particularly those with concentrations of low income parents, operated at a disadvantage that could not be overcome.

In attempting to reach conclusions as to why more specific conclusions have not been forthcoming from this section, a number of possibilities came to the evaluator's mind:

Conclusions:

1. In general the various programs studied in the Portland schools are so similar as to generate extremely few marked measurable differences.
2. The programs were so much in transition that test results could not definitely be associated with program constants which were continually changing.

3. There are certain constant forces of change and complexity that are always at work in all institutions that will make definite "cut and dried" relationships between process and product rare.

4. Non pull-out (mainstreamed) programs that are integrated into the very center of the schools' regular program will always involve so many common influences working upon Title I and non-Title I students alike as to militate against definite cause-effect relationships.

Although the evaluator was disappointed that more concrete relationships were not discovered, it may be that the implementation of some of the suggestions included in the main body of this report will make future relationships between program variables and test results more sharply defined.

EVALUATION OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

The original grant request for this study (available at the Office of Research and Evaluation) defined the objectives and evaluative procedures to be used as follows:

"Goal: To study the effectiveness of supplementing the outcomes of summative (product) evaluation with those of formative (process) evaluation, in improving the Title I programs. . . .

Evaluation: The usefulness of the program will be determined by analyzing the responses of the Title I staff, members of the Parent Advisory Councils, etc., to a questionnaire. If 80% or more of the respondents consider the information provided to be useful, the budget for the funding of similar activities will be incorporated into the Title I applications for funding in the future."

In order to comply with the intent of the above, two steps were taken. First a questionnaire was designed which would not only measure respondent reaction to the usefulness of the study, but, in addition, would provide specific information about the process evaluation's effectiveness. (Appendix L). Second, an attempt was made to determine whether the conduct of the process evaluation and all its implications had any observable impact upon the existing Title I program or the planning for future programs. Since it is to be expected that some effects will not ordinarily take place till after the completion of the study, this aspect of the evaluation can not be completed till changes have had an opportunity to be put into operation later in the 1980-81 school year. It is, therefore, suggested that a survey be conducted in November of 1980 to determine the extent to which suggestions made by this evaluation have been acted upon.

The evaluative questionnaire (Appendix L) was sent to all those adults affected by the Title I programs in grades 4, 5 and 6. A summary of the responses is presented below.

TABLE P

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS OF VARIOUS CATEGORIES WHO FOUND THE EVALUATION TO BE HELPFUL

Respondent	Number of Questionnaires Distributed	Number of Questionnaires Returned	% write out	Percent of Respondents Who Found The Evaluation Results Helpful		
				Yes	No	Qualified
Aide/Assistant	23	17	74	76	17	6
*Mathematic consultant	5	5	100	80		20
Reading consultant	6	4	67	75		25
Social worker	7	7	100	100		
Classroom teacher	57	30	53	73	23	3
Principal	8*	7	88	100		
Central office personnel	7	7	100	100		
Parents Advisory Council	16	11	69	100		
Total Results	129	88	68	84	11	4

* Including one mathematics consultant who also acts as a principal.

These results appear to be encouraging:

1. Sixty-eight percent of those canvassed responded; it should be pointed out that the respondents were asked to complete the said questionnaire anonymously.

2. Well over 80% of the respondents found the evaluation to be helpful. On the basis of the response the study appears to have successfully met its primary stated "evaluation objective." If responses were limited to Title I staff and Central Office Personnel, the approval rating would be 87%.

3. The four staffing categories which responded to the evaluation in a completely positive fashion with no qualifications i.e., social workers, principals, central office personnel and the District Advisory

Council were all non-instructional. Conversely only two of the eight respondent categories had negative reactions. They were the aides and teachers, both direct instructional categories. This interesting contrast between reactions of the instructional and the non-instructional staff appears again in other aspects of the evaluation and will be commented upon later.

Question #4 of the evalutive questionnaire summarized in Table Q provides information as to specific ways in which the process evaluation was felt to be helpful by those 84% of the respondents who answered positively. This information should be of interest because it identifies those portions of the evaluation which were felt to have provided particularly helpful information to the participants and is, therefore, another way of judging the success of the study. It also may be helpful if the nature of the responses provide decision makers indications as to which program areas Title I participants felt were most in need of clarification.

TABLE Q

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF RESPONDENTS BY CATEGORIES
WHO FOUND THE EVALUATION TO BE HELPFUL IN SPECIFIED WAYS

The evaluation was helpful in that:	Aides/ Assistants (N-17)*	Math Consultants (N-4)*	Reading Consultants (N-7)*	Social Workers*	Teachers (N-30)*	Principals (N-7)*	Central Office*	P.A.C. (N-11)*	Average Combined Percent (N-88)*
a. It clarified program problems	29	60	50	57	53	71	71	82	56
b. It helped improve communications	35	80	50	57	50	71	29	73	52
c. It clarified job responsibilities better	47	60	25	14	27	14	14	36	31
d. It clarified Title I guidelines	65	80	25	86	53	29	29	36	52
e. It proposed some suggestions that might improve the program	24	60	50	71	33	86	57	73	48
Total Average %	40	68	40	57	43.2	54.2	40	60	48

* N=Number of respondents

In the preceeding table these results appear to be noteworthy:

1. The largest percentage of respondents (56) selected item a., "IT CLARIFIED PROGRAM PROBLEMS" as being helpful to them. This reaction appears to meet one of the stated goals of this feasibility study which is to work toward "improving the Title I programs" since problem identification is usually a necessary prerequisite to program improvement.

2. The "average combined percentage" from the eight respondent categories are quite similar for all categories (ranging from 48 to 56 percent) with the exception of item c, "IT CLARIFIED JOB RESPONSIBILITIES BETTER" which, at 31 percent, was substantially lower than the other alternatives. This may mean that most respondents felt satisfied with the information already furnished them pertaining to their job descriptions. Running counter to this pattern of low responses in item "c", however, were the high reactions of the mathematics consultants (60%) and the aides (47%) who apparently felt more in need of such job descriptions possibly because of present ambiguities. Perhaps because mathematics consultants are the most recent additions to the Title I staff, there has not yet been sufficient time to clarify their responsibilities.

In a series of conversations with one mathematics consultant in particular, the evaluator encountered considerable dissatisfaction with the clarity of Title I directives particularly concerning the relationship of the mathematics directors with the classroom teachers and aides. Regarding the aides, the section on In-service Training suggested that of all staff involved in Title I, aides received the least training in compensatory education and this lack of in service may be reflected in a desire for more specific job clarification. In any event it appears that administration should direct continuing attention to further clarification of job description especially in these two particular staff areas.

Table R below utilized the information already presented in Table Q but arranged in such a fashion as to demonstrate how the eight staff categories evaluated the usefulness of the information furnished in comparison with other staff categories. For example, a higher percentage of the District Parents Advisory Council (82%) found statement a. helpful than any other staff category while the aides found it least helpful (29%).

TABLE R

STAFF RANKED FROM LEFT TO RIGHT ON THE BASIS OF POSITIVE RESPONSE IN PERCENT TO 5 STATEMENTS ABOUT THE TITLE I PROCESS EVALUATION*

a.	It clarified program problems	82% PAC	71% P CO**	60% MC	57% SW	53% T	50% RC	29% A
b.	It helpfed improve communications	80% MC	73% PAC	71% P	57% SW	50% T RC	35% A	29% CO
c.	It clarified job responsibilities better	60% MC	47% A	36% PAC	27% T	25% RC	14% SW P CO	
d.	It clarified Title I guidelines	86% SW	80% MC	65% A	53% T	36% PAC	29% P CO	25% RC
e.	It proposed some suggestions that might improve the program	86% P	73% PAC	71% SW	60% MC	57% CO	50% RC	33% T	24% A

* PAC = Parents Advisory Council
P = Principals
T = Teachers
MC = Mathematics Consultant
A = Aides/Assistants
CO = Central Office
RC = Reading Consultant
SW = Social Worker

**Where two or more staff categories registered an identical percentage response to the same question, the respondents are grouped together. These findings appear to be of interest.

1. Although no statistical tests of significance were performed, administrators (principals and central office personnel) found items "c" and "d" less helpful than the direct instruction staff (aides and assistants). Is this because the administrators felt that they already knew the guidelines and their Title I job responsibilities? The evaluation

indicated that this was not always the case.

2. On the other hand it is interesting to note the relationship between the aides' and teachers' luke warm response to item "e" "IT PROPOSED SOME SUGGESTIONS THAT MIGHT IMPROVE THE PROGRAM," and their relatively unenthusiastic position on the "helpfulness" of the study, Table P. Do their comparatively negative response in these two questions indicate a conviction that even if problems are identified, little will actually be done to improve these problems? If this conjecture is true, it would argue for a relatively timely administrative response to the evaluative study in the fall to demonstrate that once problem areas are identified, incisive administrative response will be forthcoming.

3. It is also interesting that in every category but one, (statement b. is an exception), the responses of the direct instructional staff tend to be grouped, to "move together" and differently than the responses of the administrators; for example, 71% of the administrators (principals and central office personnel) found "a" "IT CLARIFIED PROGRAM PROBLEMS," helpful as compared with only 53 and 29% of the teachers and aides respectively. On the other hand, 65% of the aides and 53% of the teachers agreed with "d" "IT CLARIFED TITLE I GUIDELINES," compared with only 29% of the administrators.

4. The respondents open-ended written answer to statement f., "OTHER WAYS IT (THE EVALUATION) HAS BEEN OR IS LIKELY TO BE HELPFUL TO YOU?" fell generally into three categories: Those dealing with the interface between Special Education and the Title I program, those concerning communications, and job descriptions, and those concerned with bringing the program into and staying in Title I compliance. It might be of note to future Title I planners that these three concerns recurred time and again throughout the evaluation and are obviously high among those issues of most interest to program participants.

Question #2 of the questionnaire addressed the issue of what material

made available during the study was read and by whom it was read. Such information may be pertinent since the effectiveness of the feasibility study will be influenced by the extent to which materials were read by the participants. The level of readability should be vital because communications were an important component of the evaluation process. The results are summarized as follows.

TABLE S

NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES OF PERSONS IN VARIOUS GROUPS, WHO DID OR DID NOT READ THE MATERIALS SENT

MATERIALS	CATEGORIES									
	Aides/Assistants (N-17)*	Math Consultants (N-5)	Reading Consultants (N-4)	Social Workers (N-7)	Teachers (N-30)	Principals (N-7)	Central Office (N-7)	P.A.C. (N-11	Average	Range
a. Title I Bulletins	71	100	75	100	70	100	71	73	77	70-100
b. The initial interim suggestions made in Feb. 1980	41	100	50	71	50	100	86	82	64	41-100
c. The Interim Report of April 1980	41	80	75	57	67	86	86	55	64	41-86
d. The Executive Summary	35	60	50	43	50	86	71	73	55	35-86
e. None of the above	24	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	3-24
f. Total Averages	47	85	63	68	59	93	79	70	-	47-93

* N = Number of respondents

The preceeding table presents some interesting results:

1. All the various categories of materials were read by at least 50% of the respondents.

2. The two staff categories with the lowest response record were the aides and teachers which were also the only categories to include some respondents who had read none of the materials.

3. The non-instructional categories read a considerably higher percentage of the material than the instructional groups. Of the three aides who felt the evaluation was not helpful as indicated in Table P, two had not read any of the materials distributed. It is surprising that with the exception of the District Parents' Advisory Council, who were not provided with an Interim Report, more respondents read the full Interim Report than the brief Executive Summary. This might suggest a high degree of interest.

The final question in the evaluative instrument, Question #5, asks "IS THERE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION THAT YOU FEEL SHOULD HAVE BEEN OBTAINED BUT WHICH WAS NOT?" The response to this question could be important to judge whether further information need be gathered in the future, to evaluate the thoroughness of the information collected by this study, and to consider the comprehensiveness of the areas considered.

TABLE T

RESPONSES BY VARIOUS GROUPS TO QUESTION #4

		Percentage		
Category	Number	Yes	No	Others
Teachers	30	10	77	13
DAC	11	9	64	27
Aides	17	12	71	17
Principals	7	14	57	29
Math Consultants	5	20	80	0
Social Workers	7	29	71	0
Central Office Personnel	7	29	71	0
Reading Consultants	4	0	50	50
Total		16	84	

A number of observations are suggested by the preceeding Table T:

1. A comfortable majority of those responding in all categories were satisfied with the information gathered by the process evaluation and requested nothing additional.

2. A smaller percentage of the instructional staff indicated a desire for further information than did other respondents. This reaction follows the pattern already noted wherein the instructional staff, although comparatively more critical of the Title I program and the process evaluation, still appeared to be less interested in receiving more information about the details of that program than the other respondents, at least through the traditional written memo, bulletin, executive summary type vehicle.

Those who did indicate a desire for more information were asked in Question #6, "... WHAT ADDITIONAL INFORMATION WOULD YOU HAVE LIKED TO HAVE HAD INCLUDED?" Curiously, the responses to this question fell into the same three general categories found in the answers to Question #4 which dealt with those areas that respondents felt were helpful but which had not been mentioned in the questionnaire. These three recurring categories followed by typical staff responses are:

1. Relationship With Special Education: "What is the impact of Title I on the learning of special needs youngsters?"

2. Communications and Job Description: "A final report specifying Title I regulations and job descriptions of each Title I employee would be desirable" and -

3. Compliance: "What administrative effort in time and personnel is necessary to ensure compliance?"

Five responses from classroom teachers to this question were not so much requests for further information as they were criticisms of the Title I program itself. For example "Why aren't we pushing the education of those who will have to support (in dollars earned from work) those

who because of the luck of birth will need to lean on others the rest of their lives" and "...I certainly feel that the Title I program as presently defined, interpreted and administered is, as the expression goes, 'counter productive,' from the classroom teachers' point of view," and "The classroom teacher has been trained to teach and he/she has the knowledge, ability, insight to know which child will need help in the classroom, regardless of the 25%!! If we are going to accept federal money, which puts conditions on us, then perhaps we should re-evaluate our goals and priorities. I feel the Title I guidelines should be changed; after all, we, the taxpayers are funding the program", and finally, "What precisely will the effect be of less service to the: (a) high achieving student and (b) average student as money and time is spent with the non-producers in society?"

Time was taken to quote these responses since they reinforce the findings made in the IMPACT section which underlined the need to stress sympathetic understanding of the nature of the program in all ways available and to include the teacher more into the mainstream of program planning and decision making.

None of the comments in either Question 4 or 6 requested information in areas which had not been included in the main report, and there were no requests for information on parent reaction or participation or the characteristics of educational leadership although both of these areas were originally to be included in this study and were only deleted because of the lack of time and resources. There were also no negative comments about the study found unless this comment from a teacher could be considered negative, "Please! Don't quote Federal Guidelines, Statutes, or Laws. Anybody can read and quote the written word. That is not creative."

The second ingredient of this evaluation of the feasibility study will deal with the impact that the process evaluation has had upon existing programs. As was indicated earlier, this investigation cannot be completed till the new program is in place in the 1980-1981 school year. The Title I Coordinator, however, has indicated that the District Advisory Council will utilize this evaluation Report as the basic planning document for the Title I near-term future. It should be remembered, however, in identifying outcomes that it will not always be possible to isolate those changes which come about as a result of the process evaluation as opposed to those which would have occurred anyway as a natural consequence of the actions of the Title I Coordinator and the District Parents' Advisory Council in their vigorous efforts to improve program and plan for the coming year. The evaluator suggests that one manner in which to evaluate the degree of response would be to request that the Title I Coordinator and the District Parents Advisory Council Chairman react to each of the suggestions that have been incorporated into the body of this Report in the following fashion:

a. This suggestion was considered to be helpful and action has been taken.

b. This suggestion was considered to be helpful but no action has been taken as yet.

c. This suggestion would probably have been implemented even if there had been no process evaluation.

d. This suggestion was not considered to be helpful.

Conclusions: The feasibility study appears to have been a success in terms of participant reaction, the readership of program documents, and its proposed use as a basic planning document. An apparent additional favorable indicator was the lack of negative comment on the part of participants when they had an opportunity for anonymous written comment

as well as the absence of any specific suggestion that additional areas should have been studied.

Suggestions:

1. The extremely high readership of the Title I Evaluation Bulletins suggests that they satisfy a need and should be continued.

2. The fact that the operating staff categories in their questionnaire responses indicated they had read Title I materials percentagewise less extensively than the non-instructional staff, that they were less positive about the evaluation - and the Title I program - and were not as interested in further program information than the non-instructional groups, suggests that there is definite need for further communication and coordination between consulting staff and classroom personnel. It is possible that this goal might better be striven for by the administration through non-written means i.e. direct verbal exchanges, "hands-on" type sessions etc.

3. The fact that the non-instructional staff sometimes tended in this study to react in a different fashion than the instructional staff, might suggest to the administration that their perceptions of how the Title I staff reacts to a certain issue, and of what information their staff have assimilated may not always be entirely accurate and should probably be carefully reexamined.

4. The receptivity of the administration and the DAC to the process evaluation in general and to its suggestions in particular suggest that this kind of process evaluation might have enough positive value to be continued on some limited basis in the future.

APPLICABILITY OF THE PROCESS EVALUATION MODEL TO OTHER TITLE I SCHOOL SYSTEMS

One indirect objective of this feasibility study was the expectation that if it were successful the methods used might be utilized with advantage by other Title I programs. And predicated upon the positive results described in the EVALUATION section, particularly the unanimously favorable response of the decision makers, the central office personnel, the principals and the District Parents Advisory Council, it appears that there is merit in such a possibility. For that reason attention should be given to the problems that would be faced in making this experimental model applicable in the field to other systems of various sizes and program characteristics. Two general questions present themselves. First, can the design of this model be employed as it was implemented in Portland, or were lessons learned during the study that would suggest changing certain procedures? Next, if the fundamental design appears to be practical, what provisions can be made to cover program expenses which, especially in the case of smaller school systems, could be excessive?

Addressing the first question, the experience gathered in the field would suggest that relatively few changes need be made in the general process evaluation format as described in PROCEDURE section of this report. Mistakes made and suggested changes to correct these deficiencies are noted later in this section. (A packet of all instruments used in this model including accompanying memos, is available from the Department of Research and Evaluation.) The steps described in the PROCEDURE section could be followed by another school wishing to create its own "in-house" process evaluation but particular emphasis should be placed on the following.

1. All adult members of the Title I community should be included in the decision as to what program areas are to be studied. (This should include classroom teachers).

2. Separate feedback as to which areas are to be examined should be gathered from decision makers. The Title I Coordinator along with the superintendent should be allowed the option of adding areas that are of particular interest to them even if they aren't included in the design developed by the Title I community. (The special instrument provided for Portland's Title I Coordinator to indicate his requests is included in the packet mentioned above.)

3. Since there was found to be so much value to staff development in the process of determining which areas were to be studied, it is critical that each system develop its own study areas based upon local needs (similar to the eleven categories developed by Portland and set forth on page 8). However, a few areas are of such fundamental "core" concern to all Title I programs that the evaluator urges they be included as a base upon which to build. They are: diagnostic and prescriptive procedures, the comprehensiveness of program communications, the effectiveness of the goal setting process, compensatory in-service and the student selection process.

4. The representatives of the teachers associations should be consulted and kept continuously posted.

5. All participants should be advised as early as possible in the process that the evaluation is neither a compliance audit nor an evaluation of individual staff members. The evaluator found that where there was misunderstanding as to this purpose, information was more difficult to obtain and appeared to be of low reliability. The evaluator found this problem a difficult one since there is a

natural tendency to describe program by using guideline compliance as a frame of reference. Such a tendency should be resisted since the purpose of a process evaluation is to improve program not to audit it. There are other evaluators whose function it is to provide this service.

6. Feed back should be provided to the principals and the faculty as quickly as possible, preferably before the evaluator leaves the school.

7. The information gathering stage should follow the three-pronged approach described in Section II as involving interview, observation and record corroboration in order that all information is viewed from three perspectives and, therefore, thrice recorded, interpreted and substantiated.

8. Every effort should be made to ensure that suggestions are made available to the Coordinator as quickly as possible and that a report be made prior to the time when decisions must be made for the next year's program.

Although the basic design as used in Portland was found to be workable, the following changes are suggested on the basis of the field experience of the evaluator:

a. It is recommended that one visitation cycle rather than two is sufficient and that the number of days originally scheduled was more than sufficient. Don't overstay your welcome! It is necessary to balance the evaluator's need for school observation time against the disruptive effect that having one more "stranger" in the school has for staff. One of the major obstacles that any evaluator faces is the natural resistance of teachers to anything that interferes with the day-to-day instructional program. It is suggested that the

time set aside in the original calendar for the "first cycle" of this study was adequate for the entire study and that the time set aside for the "second cycle" was not only unnecessary but possibly counter-productive. It was the evaluator's experience that after nine days of visitation at even a large school, faculty are anxious to move on to other matters. This is particularly true if the evaluator's visit in any way interrupts the normal routine or makes unusual demands upon staff.

b. If the instruments developed in the Portland model are not employed and local ones are drawn up, it is recommended that the evaluator schedule a few days for open-ended non-structured school observation, uncluttered with any preconceived idea of program design before he designs the instruments to be used, and that he allow sufficient time to field test them before use to make adjustments and corrections. One consultant suggested such an open-ended preliminary series of school visits. His suggestion was, unfortunately, not incorporated into the design because of time pressures but in the evaluator's opinion the program would definitely have benefited from its inclusion. Although the evaluator was generally satisfied with the instruments drawn up during this study, the one constructed for classroom observation proved to be less than satisfactory primarily due to insufficient field testing and should be redesigned before re-use.

c. Since uniform and accurate identification of Title I eligible students is <u>critical</u> to the effectiveness of the evaluation program, unusual care must be taken to ensure that pre and post testing procedures are closely coordinated with the school and that special attention is given in the design stage to seeing

to it that testing samples are large enough to provide representative samples.

d. If possible avoid the use of code numbers. Schools names are much easier for the reader to follow.

e. Provision should also be made to plan for other appropriate kinds of tests especially if additional studies are contemplated. This provision was not made in the Portland study and as a result, possible changes in student classroom behavior, or in attitude toward school could not be documented. This failure to pretest tended to limit examination of one area of social worker intervention which was inadequately covered by this evaluation.

The second general question posed at the beginning of this section is more difficult to address. How can a small school system afford the kinds of expenses incurred in an evaluation of this nature? Although it is reasonable to hope that a relatively large system - one with a student body of more than 10,000 students - would be able to sustain such an expense, other funding alternatives must be provided for the small systems which are much more typical of the New England States. A number of alternatives are possible. Consortiums can be created similar to those developed successfully in many states to provide small systems highly specialized special education services where costs can be prorated over a wide base of participating schools. It might also be possible that Title I funding, reserved for state use, could be earmarked for such an evaluative project, possibly in conjunction with the T.A.C.'s pilot program. Special federal grants might also be sought, but the indefiniteness of such funding would militate against considering them as a viable permanent source of financial aid. One possibility does exist, however, that appears to have merit.

An organization of schools could be set up within the State

of Maine, or to include even a larger geographic area such as New England, which would be similar in some ways to that of the Accrediting Associations of Schools and Colleges. The structure used to implement the process evaluation would depend upon the same three basic ingredients incorporated into the accrediting association protocol.

1. First, there would be an extended self-examination period during which the school to be evaluated would examine itself first on the basis of a structure, and using criteria standardized for the schools involved in the group and employing instruments developed jointly by representatives from the group.

2. Next, would come an evaluative visit by a "visiting committee" of peers, representatives from other participating schools, who have been given in-service training (possibly by the T.A.C.), and who had before their visit read reports developed by the school during its self evaluating cycle. This visit would conclude with an informal "feed back" meeting involving the visiting committee and the host school staff. A formal written report including suggestions would follow at a later date.

3. Lastly, a progress report would be submitted to the evaluation organization (Possibly the State Department of Education) after a pre arranged interval which would outline steps taken to respond to the Visiting Committee's suggestions.

There are a variety of ways in which the organizational needs of such a system could be answered. Once again, the structure of the Accrediting Association could serve as a model: Every member school would have the responsibility of furnishing the organization one of its Title I staff members to serve on a visiting committee and would bear the expense of providing a substitute during the committee's "visting time" (probably no more than a Sunday

through Wednesday cycle). The area T.A.C. could run in-service workshops for such potential visiting committee members as well as for Title I coordinaters who would act as chairmen of these committees. Schools would have the option of declining the invitation to provide visiting committee members if the timing was inconvenient.

The self examination period could well be the most beneficial part of the entire evaluation cycle, (if the experience of the accrediting association is any indicator) and would be coordinated by a local Title I staff member who was not the school's Title I coordinator. The instruments required for both the self-evaluation and "visiting committee" cycles would be drawn up at state-wide or district-wide workshops (perhaps funded by state grants) with at least one participant from each school system involved. Perhaps the T.A.C. could be the organizing body and the supplier of leadership talent for such workshops. The evaluation design for both self and visiting - committee cycles could be a refinement of that process developed by the Portland Public Schools as described in this Final Report and would include the various working documents included in the separate "packet" and those attached as appendices to this report.

Possible advantages implicit in this kind of an arrangement for implementing process evaluation are as follows:

a) The relatively low expense.

b) The dissemination of new ideas throughout the group, and the opportunity for a visiting committee member to compare his school's way of doing business with some new frame of reference.

c) The non-threatening nature of the self examination cycle.

d) The technical evaluation skills which participating staff might develop through such "hands on" participation in the process.

e) The feeling generated within the school of a joint team effort

in their own school's evaluation might tend to break down the normal "them against us" syndrome commonly experienced in the evaluation process.

f) The lessons learned in the self-evaluation cycle would be more apt to be internalized than would be the "suggestions for programs improvement" distributed by an outside evaluator through an impersonal written document.

g) Those staff members and coordinators who become involved as participants on a visiting committee might gain stature with their peers and would have the opportunity of becoming a kind of on-going team of "resident" evaluators, experts as to what an exemplar Title I program should and could be.

CONCLUSIONS

Although it is hoped that the reader finds the results of this foregoing formative and summative evaluation useful in improving the quality of his Title I programs, the relationships between program variables and achievement test results which we were able to point out should only be treated as tentative because of the many changes that took place during the 1979-80 school year. However, on the basis of the experience gained from this study, the authors are convinced that formative evaluation should be an integral part of program evaluation.

References

Buros, Oscar. Tests in Print, Gryphon Press, Highland Park, New Jersey, 1974

Buros, Oscar, The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Gryphon Press, Highland Park, New Jersey, 1978

Clark, David L., Lotto, Linda S. and McCarty, Martha M. Factors Associated With Success in Urban Elementary Schools, Phi Delta Kappa, 1980

Coulson, John E. National Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESSA): Summary of the Second Year Studies: Santa Monica California: Systems Development Corporation, July, 1976

Hill, Paul and Rotberg, Iris. Evaluating Compensatory Education, An Interim Report on the NIE Compensatory Education Study, National Institute of Education, 1976

National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Compensatory Education Study: Executive Summary, Washington, D.C., July, 1978

Park, Joanne S. Winners All, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970

Roberts, A. Oscar H. and Tallmadge, G. Kasten. Composite Success, ESEA Title I Evaluation and Reporting System, RMC Research Corporation, Mountain View, California, 1976

Singh, Balwant and Jones, Noel K. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Project, Fall, 1974

Singh, Balwant and Hammond, Richard. Evaluation of ESEA Title I Project: 1975-76 School Year, September, 1976

Singh, Balwant. An Evaluation of the ESEA Title I Project for the 1976-77 School Year. October, 1977

Sweeney, Jack, and Blaschke, C. The Cost Effectiveness of Michigan Compensatory Education Programs, Education Turnkey Systems, 1975

Talmadge, G. Kasten. Selecting Students for Title I Projects, ESEA Title I Evaluation and Reporting System, RMC Research Corporation, Mountain View, California, 1978

vander Ploey, Arie J., Formal and Informal Evaluation: To Serve Two Masters Well, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts, April, 1980

Wargo, Michael J.; Tallmadge, G. Kasten; Michaels, Debra D.; Lippen, Demay; and Morris, Sarah J. Further Examination of Exemplary Programs for Educating Disadvantaged Children, Palo Alto, California - American Institute for Research, July, 1971

Watkins, James and Singh, Balwant. An Evaluation of the ESEA Title I Program for the 1977-78 School Year. November, 1978

Appendices

Appendix A:* Questionnaires for Administrators, DAC and Title 1 Staff.

Appendix B:* Preliminary Suggestions, Title I Evaluation, First Report, Feb. 8, 1980.

Appendix C: Relationship of Diagnostic/Prescriptive Activity and Social Worker intervention to Achievement.

Appendix D:* Title I Formative Evaluation: General and Specific Forms.

Appendix E:* Additions made to Title I School Staff during the Course of the Process Evaluation as a result of the availability of Additional Funding.

Appendix F:* Distribution of In-Service Activities.

Appendix G:* Aide/Assistant Classroom Teacher Meeting Time-Chart

Appendix H:* Sources of Information on In-Service Training in Compensatory Education.

Appendix I:* Title I Coordinator Steven Adamowski's Memo of October 1, 1979 Describing the Nomination Process.

Appendix J: Title I Evaluation Bulletin #2.

Appendix K: Questionnaire to ascertain the Impact of Title I Programs upon the Classroom Teacher.

Appendix L: "Questionnaire to determine the Usefulness of the Process Evaluation Study."

Appendix M: Reading and Mathematics Consultants' Questionnaire to Determine the Nature of their Diagnostic and Prescriptive work with a Group of Randomly Selected Students.

Appendix N: Executive Summary available upon request at the Office of Research and Evaluation.

* This appendix was included with the Interim Report and will not be repeated here. Additional copies are available at the Office of Research and Evaluation.

APPENDIX A

December 4, 1979

To: All Title I Staff involved with Grades 4, 5, and 6.

From: Chuck Callanan (Title I Evaluation Consultant)

Subject: Title I Evaluation

This year in addition to the regular year-end evaluation of our Title I Program required by law, the Portland Public Schools will undergo an additional evaluation limited to our 4th, 5th & 6th grade Title I programs. The purpose of this new "Process Evaluation" as it is called, is to describe in detail all the important factors that influence our Title I programs, in the hope that by documenting exactly what is being done for our Title I students, we may discover helpful relationships between the way we actually run our program and the results of these programs as seen in our students' year-end STEP testing.

And so, to begin this evaluation, I plan in the middle of January to start visiting Title I Elementary Schools gathering information and trying to inconvenience you as little as possible in the process. I will be describing on a kind of check-list basis who does what in each school, detailing how our program works - not evaluating indiviidual people. The goal will be to provide information useful towards making a better Title I program. You can help me a great deal in the design of this check list and the entire evaluation program by sharing your ideas with me as to what you feel are the most critical ingredients that influence our youngsters' education. Although we can't possibly look at everything, your input will help us decide which are the vital factors:

Toward this end I ask that you fill out the enclosed questionnaire. (I'm afraid that there will be more of them as time goes on) Would you then please return the completed questionnaire to me at the Central Office? And please, during the entire progress of this evaluation contact me at 775-0900 ext. 228 if you have any questions.

Many thanks,

Chuck Callanan

APPENDIX A

Title I Process Evaluation Staff Input

December 4, 1979

1. This form was completed by (Please circle)

Teacher Assistant
Principal
Math Specialist
Social Worker
Teacher Aide
*Classroom Teacher
Reading Consultant

2. In the spaces provided below please fill in those factors which you believe are extremely important to the success of a Title I Program and which you suggest we closely look at in our Process Evaluation. (We obviously won't be able to examine everything) We have started the list off with a number of possibilities to help "trigger" your own ideas. Please place a check mark beside any of these you feel are critical and then add your own suggestions. (Please print)

IMPORTANT EDUCATIONAL FACTORS

a. Our staffing patterns (the ratio of aides to assistants, to social workers, to reading consultants, etc.)

b. The way we select Title I students. (Basically, we now select children who test in the lowest quarter)

c. Different teaching patterns used. (tutoring a child one-on-one in class as opposed "to pulling him out". Small student groups or large groups, etc.)

d. Our diagnostic processes (How we decide where a child needs help and how we follow up on this information.)

e. The actual time of instruction in each subject (as compared to scheduled time. "Time on Task")

f. The understanding of staff as to exactly what their duties are under the Title I Program.

g. The organization of the program

h. Adult/student ratio (The number of students to each Title I adult)

i. The experience and background of the staff

j. Communications between staff and classroom teacher

k. Attitudes and support of parents

l. Attitudes of staff.

* Although classroon teachers are not defined as Title I Staff, we would welcome their response to this questionnaire.

PLEASE SEE REVERSE SIDE

Your suggestions:

APPENDIX A

November 27, 1979

Information helpful in bringing the Title I Process Evaluation into focus:

1. **What kind of decisions would you be apt to make on the basis of this study:**

   Decisions concerning such things as:

   a) selection of Title I students (25%ile - staff nomination)
   b) changing staffing patterns (i.e., ratio of consultants to aides, etc.)
   c) changing program emphasis (i.e., from personnel to materials, etc.)
   d) which grade levels benefit most from Title I services
   e) reinforce "successful" patterns, eliminate unsuccessful ones
   f) look for new type Title I programs

   other _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. **What kind of information can we furnish you that you would find particularly helpful?**

   a) Breakdown of task time for all levels of Title I staff, i.e., how do staff spend their work days?
   b) Relationships between student achievement on STEP tests and some variable in services delivered
   c) Extent of coordination between classroom teacher and Title I staff
   d) Time-on-task type information
   e) Information concerning classroom teachers' impact on Title I program
   f) Relationship between Title I services and attendance and tardiness
   g) Attitudinal studies
   h) Information concerning parent involvement and support
   i) How aware staff are of their particular Title I responsibilities
   j) Information concerning our student identification model
   k) How do support activities affect attendance, achievement
   l) General knowledge of Title I guidelines
   m) Expectations of principals for Title I program

   other _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

(use back if needed)

APPENDIX B

"So many men, so many opinions, everyone his own way."

Terence

To: Steven Adamowski, Title I Coordinator

From: Charles Callanan, Title I Consultant

Subject: Interim Recommendations, Title I Process Evaluation - First Report

Date: Feb. 8, 1980

One of the characteristics of a process evaluation is the flexibility it offers to provide on-going feedback and recommendations to staff while the program is in operation and the information gathered can be of maximum advantage. Suggestions will, therefore, be made as their need becomes evident during this evaluation, and an informal interim report will be presented as early as possible in April. The final report, filed by July 15, will correlate all program characteristics with student testing gains.

As part of this policy of on-going feedback and on the basis of those schools visited to date and individual and group interviews so far conducted, these recommendations are suggested. It is, of course, understood that you will already be aware of some of these concerns and be moving toward their solution, or are aware of them and have decided for various reasons not to address them at the moment. The following are for your consideration:

A. Since there is significant transfer of students from one Portland Title I public school to another, it is important to ensure that the continuity of educational services given those Title I students be interrupted as little as possible during the transfer process. To keep this interruption to a minimum, it is suggested that:

1. one staff member in each school be assigned the responsibility of seeing that the transfer of information and records involving Title I students (especially having to do with any recent diagnostic testing or prescriptive academic program) be carried out as quickly and comprehensively as possible. Such a staff member (the social worker might be a natural choice) would act as an ombudsman for Title I students in transit. The "ombudsman" from the sending school would contact the "ombudsman" in the receiving school either by phone or through whatever combination of informal or formal memorandum-type format that is judged to be most effective. A method will need to be developed by which the sending school "ombudsman" is notified of all his or her school's Title I student transfers before they take place.

2. The regular student transfer card should be amended to identify a transferring student as having been eligible for Title I services at the sending school.

3. Policies should be developed to detail the manner in which a student may become eligible for Title I services who has transferred into the Portland school system during the school year from another system or has transferred from a non-Title I school to a Title I school.

B. The special services and programs offered students by the Title I program are usually closely interrelated with those services offered by Special Education. Since many students are serviced by both programs, coordination is often extremely desirable. At the moment such coordination is often

-over-

carried out in an informal and ad hoc manner in the affected schools. It is recommended, therefore, that one staff member in each school be made formally responsible for the coordination (interface) of these two programs. (The PET chairman in each school could be one possibility.) It would not appear to be realistic to attempt to consider one program without considering the other, and it might be well in the future to investigate various ways in which the two programs and their respective staff members can be made to reinforce and complement one another.

C. It is evident even at this preliminary stage of the study, that many of those involved with the Title I program are not as comprehensively informed about the details of the program as they would like. A considerable number of those already interviewed have indicated a desire for more information and expressed a general dissatisfaction with the Title I communications process. A more detailed analysis of this problem will be prepared for the interim and final reports, but for current consideration the following recommendations are made:

1. that the Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education and the district PAC chairman participate on a regular basis in the Title I Evaluation Bulletin, with the hope that such a publication as this may be continued on an on-going basis after the evaluation is completed to clarify issues and keep those involved up-to-date. (This possibility has already been discussed with you.)

2. that a brief and succinct "handbook" be developed explaining the philosophy, funding and other pertinent details to be given out each year to Title I staff and PAC Chairman.

3. that questions concerning Title I concerns which already have been posed by interviewed Title I staff be answered in the "Bulletin" at an early opportunity. (Some other vehicle for presenting these answers to the Title I community may be judged by you to be more effective.) Clarification of the following questions is suggested:

   a. To what extent must Title I staff work <u>only</u> with designated Title I eligible students?

   b. What is the relationship of locally funded reading consultants to the Title I program?

   c. What is the relationship between the Title I program and the Special Education program?

   d. How are students selected for inclusion in the Title I program, and is this determined nationally or locally?

   e. Who should give Title I aides and assistants their directions for the daily instructional program?

   f. What is the nature of the funds which have recently been made available to the Title I program?

From time to time other questions of this nature may arise in my interviewing process and will be passed on to you.

D. There has been no consensus among staff questioned so far in my interviews as to their understanding of specific Title I goals and behavioral objectives. Since educational program is usually expected to be an outgrowth of particular goals generally accepted and understood, it is suggested that the various decision-making bodies clarify their understanding of both systemwide as well as individual elementary school goals in preparation for deliberations this spring and summer when program proposals must be formed for the coming school year. Such inspection of existing goal understanding in as concrete terms as possible could help current as well as future programs.

cc Don Christie
Peter Greer
Eve Pither
Balwant Singh
Carmen Marcy
Bill McCalmon
Mildred Kaye
Don Cichon
Marti Willard
All Title I School Principals
Elementary & Jr. High
Dr. Roland Kimball

APPENDIX C

Relationship of Diagnostic/Prescriptive Activity and Social Worker Intervention to Achievement

Donald J. Cichon
RMC Research Corporation, Portsmouth, New Hampshire
July, 1980

Since specific diagnostic and prescriptive work with students in compensatory education has been found in the research literature to be an important factor contributing to the achievement of such youngsters, an analysis was conducted to examine the extent to which this relationship held for Portland's Title I students. The analysis also attempted to determine which specific diagnostic, prescriptive and social worker activities contributed most to achievement gains. The results generally indicated that there was no strong relationship. A full description of this analysis follows.

A sample of 24 students was randomly selected from grades 4, 5 and 6 in each of the Title I schools. The reading and math consultants and social workers were given a questionnaire to complete for each of the sample students. These questionnaires sought information on each of the following items (shown below along with associated paraphrased statements to be used in the remainder of the discussion; the complete items on the questionnaires are shown in _____ _____):

1. Whether the student received a PET or not (PET)
2. The extent of testing for reading diagnosis (Reading diagnosis)
3. The extent of testing for math diagnosis (Math diagnosis)
4. The types of records kept on diagnostic information--general to specific (Test records)

5. The uses made of diagnostic information--general to specific (Test use)
6. The specificity of written prescriptions (Written prescriptions)
7. The specificity of written objectives for the student (Objectives)
8. The extent to which student progress was monitored--seldom to frequently (Monitor)
9. The number of conferences which the social worker had with a student and parents (Number of conferences)
10. The frequency of conferences which the social worker had with the student (Conference frequency).

The regression analysis sought to determine: (1) the extent to which the foregoing items (independent variables) were correlated, as a group, with achievement score gains (dependent variable) of individual students; (2) where the relationship was significant, those variables which most and least contributed to the achievement gains. Presumably, if a strong relationship were shown and if a few of the independent variables were seen to contribute most to the achievement gains, then those items could be recommended for increased implementation by Title I staff to attain even greater gains. The regression analysis was performed for each of the three STEP test score gains available: math computation, math concepts, and reading.

Summaries of the results of each analysis are presented in Tables I, II and III below. The Regression subprogram of SPSS with stepwise inclusion was used (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, Bent, 1975).

Table 1

Summary Statistics for Regression of Math Computation Gains on Diagnostic/Prescriptive Activities and Social Worker Activities

Predictor	B	Standardized Coefficient	Overall F of Step	df	p<
Monitor	1.095	0.337	8.36	1,79	.005
Written Prescription	6.359	0.474	4.83	2,78	.01
Test Use	-6.784	-0.600	3.61	3,77	.025
Math Diagnosis	-1.392	-0.262	3.13	4,76	.05
Number of Conferences	2.728	0.594	2.85	5,75	.05
Conference Frequency	-3.101	-0.467	2.48	6,74	.05
Objectives	2.254	0.225	2.15	7,73	.05
Test Records	1.079	0.136	1.91	8,72	n.s.

Multiple R = 0.418

R^2 = 0.175

APPENDIX C

Table II

Summary Statistics for Regression of Math Concepts Gains on Diagnostic/Prescriptive and Social Worker Activities

Predictor	B	Standardized Coefficient	Overall F of Step	df	p≤
Test Use	-0.639	-0.007	3.52	1,79	.10
PET	1.227	0.092	2.31	2,78	n.s.
Test Records	-0.466	-0.071	1.61	3,77	n.s.
Objectives	-0.545	-0.066	1.23	4,76	n.s.
Conference Frequency	2.516	0.459	1.01	5,75	n.s.
Number of Conferences	-1.589	-0.419	0.92	6,74	n.s.
Monitor	-0.171	-0.064	0.79	7,73	n.s.
Written Prescrptions	-0.447	-0.040	0.69	8,72	n.s.

Multiple R = 0.266

R^2 = 0.071

APPENDIX C

Table III

Summary Statistics for Regression of Reading Gains on Diagnostic/Prescriptive and Social Worker Activities

Predictor	B	Standardized Coefficient	Overall F of Step	df	p<
Written Prescriptions	-3.264	-0.385	2.38	1,69	n.s.
Test Records	3.093	0.291	2.78	2,68	n.s.
Objectives	1.235	0.162	2.19	3,67	n.s.
Test Use	-1.446	-0.138	1.81	4,66	n.s.
Monitor	-0.251	-0.091	1.49	5,65	n.s.
Number of Conferences	-2.390	-0.679	1.26	6,64	n.s.
Conference Frequency	3.216	0.634	1.31	7,63	n.s.
PET	-1.119	-0.062	1.15	8,62	n.s.
Reading Diagnosis	0.173	0.049	1.02	9,61	n.s.

Multiple R = 0.361

R^2 = 0.131

APPENDIX C

For the data in all three tables, the order of the independent variables as shown is the order in which they were entered by the stepwise inclusion into the regression equation by the program. As can be seen from Table I, the multiple correlation of 0.418 shows a moderate relationship between the activities and the Math Computation gains, and the analysis of variance of the regression on the first seven predictors was significant. This relationship, however, accounts for only 17.5% of the common variance between the activities and achievement gains, and therefore is not strong enough to warrant any action by the Title I program on the basis of the result. As the data in Tables II and III indicate, the small multiple correlations evidence only weak relationships between achievement gains and diagnostic/prescriptive and social worker activities in Math Concepts and Reading.

The strength of specific activities (labelled Predictors in the tables) can be examined more closely in the tables by the interested reader. For example, in the Math Computation analysis, the use to which diagnostic tests were put contributed quite strongly to achievement gains, but in a negative direction (standardized regression coefficient = -0.600); that is, the more individualized the use of these results, the less the students gained in Math Computation. The same is true for the frequency of conferences with social workers (-0.467). On the other hand, the number of conferences with social workers is positively associated with Math Computation gains (0.594) in comparison with the other listed activities. But given the overall lack of sufficiently strong relationships between the predictor variables and the achievement gains, the discussion of specific activities will not be pursued further.

Complete results of this analysis are available from _____

_____.

APPENDIX D

TITLE I FORMATIVE EVALUATION STUDY: GENERAL INTERVIEW FORM

Date _____

1. Respondent Code: _____

2. Respondent Category Code: _____

3. School Code(s) and percentage of time spent in each:

   a. _____% b. _____%

4. Grade Level(s): Circle 9 if not applicable:

   4 _____% 5 _____% 6 _____% 9 _____

5. Respondent works in the area of:

   a. Reading _____ b. Mathematics _____ c. Both _____ d. N.A. _____

6. Do you concentrate on any grade level(s)?

   a. Yes _____ No _____

   b. If yes, which one? Primary _____ Intermediate _____

7. How many years have you worked in the Title I program? _____

8. Did you work at this (these) school(s) during the 1978-79 school year also? Yes ___ No ___

9. How would you briefly describe your major responsibility in the Title I program?

   _____

   _____

   _____

10. To whom are you responsible on a day to day basis?

    Teacher: _____ Principal: _____

    Consultant: _____ Other (please specify): _____

11. Is this relationship clear-cut? Yes ____ No ____

    Please explain: _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

APPENDIX D

Title I Formative Evaluation Study: General Interview Form - Pg. 2

12. What are the goals and objectives of the Title I program in your school?

a. Raise achievement level of Title I students to _____

_____

b. Provide individualized and small group instruction in Reading/Mathematics.

_____

c. Improve basic skill level _____

d. To improve students' social and emotional well-being in order to improve their ability to learn. _____

e. _____

_____

f. _____

_____

13. What written records dealing with the Title I program, do you keep?

A. a. Testing records _____ b. Case histories (anecdotal) _____

c. Lists of Title I eligible students _____ d. Prescriptive-type notebooks _____

e. Planning notebooks _____ f. Others (please specify) _____

_____

B. Could I have a typical sample? _____

14. Approximately how much time do you spend each week in discussing Title I related problems with the following?

Title	One hour or less	Between 1 and 2 hours	More than 2 hours	Not applicable
Teacher				
Aide/Assistant				
Reading Consultant				
Mathematics Consultant				
Principal				
Social Worker				

Title I Formative Evaluation Study: General Interview Form - Pg. 3

15. From whom do you receive information concerning Title I programs?

Classroom Teacher _____ Reading/Mathematics Consultant _____

Principal _____ Assistant Superintendent _____

PAC _____ Other (please specify) _____

Don't receive any _____

16. How do you receive information concerning Title I programs? Through

Staff meetings _____

Personal Contacts _____

Newsletters _____

Memoranda from _____

Other (please specify) _____

17. Considering the high mobility rate among schools, do you share information with colleagues in other Portland Title I schools concerning individual Title I students who are transferring?

Yes _____ No _____

18. If your answer to Q. 17 above is yes, how is this information exchanged?

Telephone calls _____ Standard form _____

Written Memos _____ Regular meetings _____

Other (please specify) _____

19. Are communications with respect to Title I programs, regulations, etc., satisfactory?

Yes _____ No _____

20. If your answer to Q. 19 above is no, how could those be improved?

_____

_____

_____

21. How are students identified in your school(s) for the delivery of Title I services?

25th percentile and below on STEP Reading and/or Mathematics _____

_____

_____

_____

Title I Formative Evaluation Study: General Interview Form - Pg. 4

22. Do you use any other method of identification?

Yes _____ No _____

23. If your answer to Q. 22 above is yes, what method is used?

Nomination _____ Other (please specify) _____

24. Which of the following can nominate?

Teacher _____ Aide/Assistant _____ Consultants _____ PAC _____

Principal _____ Social Worker _____ Other (please specify) _____

25. Which one(s) of the following can approve the delivery of services to students who are nominated?

Teacher _____ Consultant _____ Don't know _____

Principal _____ Other (please specify) _____

26. Who is responsible for updating the lists of Title I students sent by the Department of Research & Evaluation?

Teacher Aide/Assistant _____ Teacher _____

Consultant _____ School secretary _____

Principal _____ Other (please specify) _____

No one is responsible. _____ Don't know _____

27. If you believe that some students are misplaced by the Title I identification process, could you give me the names of one or two students who are

a. not receiving Title I services but should have been receiving?

_____ _____

b. currently receiving Title I services but should not be receiving?

_____ _____

28. How can we improve the method of identifying students for Title I services?

_____

_____

_____

29. Have you received any in-service training during the 1979-80 school year?

Yes _____ No _____

30. If your answer to Q. 29 is yes, please check from the following that apply.

Method Used		FREQUENCY				EVALUATION		
		Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Other Specify	Helpful	Not Helpful	Not Sure
Pre-School Orientation								
Workshops								
Consultation with Reading Consultants								
Consultation with Math. Consultants								
Newsletter & Other Materials								
Staff Meetings								
Special Courses Taken								
Other (please specify)								

31. What kind of in-service offerings are most helpful to you?

32. What educational services do you feel Title I students receive that they would not receive were it not for the Title I program?

33. What do you feel from your professional experience is the single most important characteristic of the Title I program?

_____

_____

_____

34. What single suggestion do you have that would improve our Title I program?

_____

_____

_____

2. What percent of your time is spent working with students in Math. and Reading in

One to one tutorial_____ Groups of 2 to 4_____

Groups of 5 to 9 _____ Groups of over 9_____

Entire class _____

3. Where do you do your remedial work? Give a % if you use a variety of approaches:

Separate group in the classroom_____ _____%

With children at their desks _____ _____%

Out of the regular classroom individually _____ _____%

Out of the regular classroom in groups _____ _____%

4. Is the space available for work outside the classroom adequate?

Yes_____ No_____

5. Who prepares your instructional materials?

Reading	Math.	
☐	☐	Classroom teacher
☐	☐	Consultant
☐	☐	Self
☐	☐	Other_____

6. What program(s) do you use?

Reading		Math.	
ECRI	☐	Addison Wesley 79	☐
Basal Reader	☐	D. C. Heath	☐
Ginn	☐	ESM	☐
Other	☐	Heath 75	☐
		Other	☐

_____ Specify

_____ Specify

APPENDIX D

TITLE I FORMATIVE EVALUATION STUDY
SPECIFIC FORM FOR TEACHER AIDES/ASSISTANTS

1. In a typical week which of the following activities are you apt to be involved with? Please estimate the time you spend on the activities listed below for grades 4, 5 and 6 only. Disregard the time spent on activities related to grades 1, 2 and 3. Please attach schedule if available.

Activity	Time in 35 hour week for grades 4, 5 & 6 only (In hours and fractions thereof)	Percentages (for office use only)
a) Working with children in Math. during core period	____ _____	_____
b) Working with children in language arts during core period, including reading to students	____ _____	_____
c) Working with children in math. during non core period	____ _____	_____
d) Working with children in reading during non core period	____ _____	_____
Total hrs. math.	____ _____	_____
Total hrs. reading	____ _____	_____
e) Working with children in other subjects (describe)	____ _____	_____
f) Consulting with classroom teacher	____ _____	_____
If yes, describe the purpose of the consultation. _____		
_____		
_____		
g) Preparation of materials	____ _____	_____
h) Recess or cafeteria duty	____ _____	_____
i) Clerical (includes correcting tests, homework, etc.)	____ _____	_____
j) Classroom management (dispensing pills, discipline, etc.)	____ _____	_____
k) Other (explain)	____ _____	_____
_____		_____
_____		_____

APPENDIX D

TITLE I FORMATIVE EVALUATION STUDY

SPECIFIC FORM FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

1. In which of the following ways do Title I services specifically and significantly help the Title I eligible youngsters in your classroom? (Please check and explain.)

a) Your aide or assistant takes over class leaving you free to provide more individualized instruction to Title I students. ____ _____

_____

_____

b) Use of social worker services ____ _____

_____

_____

c) Consultants provide you with specialized assistance in meeting the individual needs of particular Title I students, i.e., diagnostic work-ups, I.E.P.'s, etc.

____ _____

_____

d) Consultants working with individual students (tutoring) ____ _____

_____

_____

e) Consultants help you improve your skills in working with educationally disadvantaged students. ____ _____

_____

f) Aides or assistants provide extra individual help to the students. ____

_____

_____

g) Other _____

_____

_____

d) Who decides who will be tested? _____

e) What testing procedures are used with students who transfer in during the school year? _____

_____

f) Do you have specific objectives for each Title I student?

Yes _____ No _____

_____

4. What program(s) do you use?

Reading		Math.	
ECRI	☐	Addison Wesley 79	☐
Basal reader	☐	D. C. Heath	☐
Ginn	☐	ESM	☐
Other	☐	Heath 75	☐
		Other	☐

_____ Specify

_____ Specify

5. Where do you do your remedial work? Give a % if you use a variety of approaches:

Separate group in the classroom	____	____%
With children at their desks	____	____%
Out of the regular classroom individually	____	____%
Out of the regular classroom in groups	____	____%
Don't work directly with students	____	

6. Is the space available for work outside the classroom adequate? Yes ____ No ____

APPENDIX D

TITLE I FORMATIVE EVALUATION STUDY

SPECIFIC FORM FOR READING AND MATHEMATICS CONSULTANTS

1. In a typical week which of the following activities are you apt to be involved with? Please check the proper column and estimate the amount of time (as a percentage of your regular work week) that you spend in each activity.

Activity	Total time as a percentage of your regular work week	
	Subject:	Math. / Reading
a) Diagnostic work	___	_____%
b) Creating IEP's	___	_____%
c) Tutoring	___	_____%
d) Giving in-service training - Teachers	___	_____%
e) Giving in-service training and supervising aides/assistants	___	_____%
f) Selecting and procuring materials	___	_____%
g) Consulting with classroom teacher	___	_____%
h) Consulting with social worker	___	_____%
i) Other _____	___	_____%

2. In your conferences with the classroom teacher, what usually is the purpose of the consultation? Who usually initiates the conference? Is it useful?

   a) Purpose: _____

   b) Who initiates: Consultant ____ Teacher ____

   c) Useful: Yes ____ No ____

   d) Frequency: Daily ____ Weekly ____ Monthly ____ Other (specify) ____

3. What are the diagnostic methods used with Title I students in your school?

   a) Is everyone below the 25%ile tested in addition to the regular SCAT/STEP testing?

      Yes ____ No ____

   b) If yes, what instrument is used? _____

   c) If some students are not tested, who is tested? _____

APPENDIX D

TITLE I FORMATIVE EVALUATION STUDY

SPECIFIC FORM FOR SOCIAL WORKERS

1. In a typical week, which of the following activities are you apt to be involved with? Please check the proper column and estimate the amount of time (as a percentage of your regular work week) that you spend on each activity.

Activity	Participation	Total Time as a percentage of your regular work week
a. Receive referrals on children from various school personnel, parents, and the community for reasons of behavior, health, clothing and learning difficulties.	_____	_____
b. Counsel and use casework principles with individual children.	_____	_____
c. Consult with teachers, parents, pupils and other school personnel concerning children with learning, behavioral, social and emotional problems.	_____	_____
d. Specifically attempt to improve attendance pattern.	_____	_____
e. Serve as part of an educational team (P.E.T.) i) to assist in identifying the special needs of students, and ii) to develop an educational program to meet these needs.		
f. Provide in-service training for school personnel in the social worker's area of experience.	_____	_____
g. Implement programs of a preventative nature which would assure normal, healthy emotional growth such as DUSO, Human Development Program (Magic Circles), etc.	_____	_____
h. Provide information to the parents concerning their children, the school and its program.	_____	_____
i. Interview the parents in the home or school for the purpose of obtaining diagnostic information (child development, sociological evaluation, medical evaluation, etc.).	_____	_____
j. Work with parents to effect change in their attitude toward the child through parental conferences and parent education groups (Koping with Kids).	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____

2. Approximately how many children have you worked with during the past month? _____

3. Is there a group of Title I students with which you consistently work? May I have their names? (Confidentiality will be observed.)

4. Do you have any hard evidence that your actions are improving the problems, i.e., attendance or behavioral data?

_____

_____

APPENDIX E

ADDITIONS MADE TO TITLE I SCHOOL STAFF DURING THE COURSE OF THE PROCESS EVALUATION AS A RESULT OF THE AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL UNEXPECTED FUNDING

1. Jack Elementary School added six aides/assistants and one social worker.

2. Hall School added four aides/assistants. The mathematics consultant, formerly half-time, became full-time.

3. Riverton School added one aide/assistant and additional materials.

4. Reiche School added one remedial reading teacher. The mathematics consultant, formerly half-time, became full-time.

5. Presumpscot added one aide/assistant and additional materials.

6. Nathan Clifford and West Schools decided to offer a Title I summer school program rather than add additional personnel.

APPENDIX F

IN-SERVICE TRAINING DISTRIBUTION

The letters e, h, i, c, j, p indicate the code designations for the Title I schools involved.

	FREQUENCY				EVALUATION		
Method Used	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Sporadically	Helpful	Not Helpful	Not Sure
Pre-School Orientation				e h c ppp	e h c p	p	
Workshops			p	h c jjjjj e iiii jj ccc pp	h c e iii jjj c p	j c i	
Consultation with Reading Consultants	c	hh c jjjjj	c	c pp eeee jjj iiiii	jjjjjjj eeee iiiii ccc	e	
Consultation with Math. Consultants	c c	hh cc jjj	j c p	ee jj iiiii c p	pp jjjjjj ee hh iiiii cccc		
Newsletter & Other Materials		i		e p	e		
Staff Meetings Prof. Meetings			i p	eee h c pp	ee hh c p	p	
Special Courses Taken Univers.		i		c p	c		
Other (please specify)			p	e cc jj	e cc j p		
Social Workers Clinical Super.			e h c i j p		e h i j p c		
State Dept. of Ed.-Gen. Conf.			p	i cc jj	i cc j p		

FINDINGS:

72 in-service offerings were sporadic in nature (68%)

34 " " " " regular " " (32%)

47 staff members received in-service during the past year 68%

22 " " " no " " " " " " 32%

CONCLUSIONS:

Although 68% of staff received some in-service, a relatively small percent of those did so on a regular basis.

APPENDIX G

AIDE AND CLASSROOM TEACHER MEETING TIME WITH CONSULTANTS PER WEEK

	Aides/Assistants (N=22)		Teachers (N=30)	
	With Reading Consultant	With Mathematics Consultant	With Reading Consultant	With Mathematics Consultant
1 Hour or Less	12	6	24	22
1 to 2 Hours			2	3
More than 2 Hours				

Findings

A. 22 and 24 teachers out of 30: approx. 75% met with consultants

B. 12 and 6 aides out of 22: 55% and 27% met with consultants

APPENDIX H

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON INSERVICE TRAINING IN COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

1. Maine Facilitator Center, P. O. Box 1391, Gardiner, Maine, 04345, Catherine Harding, Associate Director, Phone 582-7211

2. Basic Skills in Reading, E.S.E.A. 1 School Admin. Building, 88 Lowell St., Manchester, N.H., 03104, Phone 603-668-8882

3. Vermont Resource Agent Program. A program of the Vermont Department of Education, Montpelier, Vt., 05602, Mary Perry, Coordinator. (Catalog available in the Office of Research and Evaluation)

Portland Public Schools

331 Veranda Street, Portland, Maine 04103

APPENDIX I

Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education

October 1, 1979

To: Title I Principals

From: Steven Adamowski, Asst. Supt. for Elementary Education

Re: Title I Update

On September 12, 1979, the Title I PAC voted to recommend the following policy:

"For determination of whether Title I services should be given, any student is eligible for consideration who:

a. is not a full time special education student
b. has one or more reading or math achievement test score at, or below, the 25th percentile or is determined eligible for the program on the basis of academic need by the reading and/or math consultant, subsequent to referral by teacher or principal."

This policy is supported by me in an effort to provide principals flexibility in meeting the needs of students who were not identified according to the regular testing criteria. However, it must be implicitly understood that the above criteria is for consideration, and that principals and reading and math consultants should exercise prudent judgement in admitting students not identified by the testing process. The number of Title I eligible students identified through the test has declined, relative to the overall decline in student enrollment. Given this, any proportional rise in the Title I population points us in the direction of a general assistance, as opposed to impact, model, further weakening our overall compliance posture.

A 'full-time" special education student is legally defined as a youngster who spends 51% or more time in a special education classroom as documented by the I.E.P.

Due to the fact that all school PAC's have not yet been elected or lack sufficient members, the October 10, 1979 has been cancelled.

Regardless of procedual issues, each Title I principal should come to the November 14, 1979 meeting with a list of names representing the proper number of PAC members for their school.

On Friday, November 9, 1979, please submit the current list of Title I youngsters from your school, so that this information may be aggregated and presented at the November meeting, per motion of September 12, 1979.

APPENDIX J

"Now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is perhaps, the end of the beginning."

Sir Winston Churchill

TITLE I EVALUATION BULLETIN #2

1. CLARIFICATION: As you may recall the first Bulletin promised that Title I Coordinator Steve Adamowski would clear up a number of points concerning the Portland Public Schools' Title I Program. Here are Steve's responses:

"Chuck Callanan, Evaluation Consultant, has asked me to answer several questions which have frequently arisen in the course of his Title I evaluation.

"As many of you are aware we have been 'gearing up' this year in order to achieve total compliance with the new federal audit guidelines. We anticipate that next year we will be in total compliance. Therefore, my answers to the questions listed by Mr. Callanan in his last Evaluation Bulletin reflect how we will operate next year. In some cases there will be a slight variance with what you observe in your school at this time.

"Q. To what extent must Title I staff work only with designated Title I eligible students?

A. Title I staff are funded by the federal government to work exclusively with Title I students, students identified as having maximum need for remediation in reading or math. Under no circumstances are non-Title I students to be served on any kind of a regular or scheduled basis by Title I funded staff. This does not mean however, that a Title I staff member cannot respond to non-Title I participating students in emergencies or on occasions when it is the spontaneous and reasonable thing to do. In other words, the rule of reasonableness and common sense should prevail controlled by the fact that Title I participating students are the clients of the program and all Title I services must be concentrated upon them.

In addition to the above, Title I staff can be employed up to a maximum of 10% of their in-school time on non-instructional supervisory duties, i.e., lunch and recess supervision, etc., as long as they perform these duties on exactly the same basis as other non-Title I people. For example, if non-Title I aides spend only 5% of their regular in-school day in general supervisory non-instructional duties, then Title I staff may also spend 5% of their time in this fashion -- but no more.

Finally, this flexibility of 10% applies only to non-instructional supervisory type work and does not mean that Title I staff can work with non-Title I students up to 10% of their time in the regular academic areas.

-over-

"Q. What is the relationship of locally funded reading consultants to the Title I program?

A. The locally funded consultants have the same relationship to the Title I program as federally funded consultants, i.e., to diagnose and prescribe instruction for those students eligible to receive Title I services, to provide in-service training for aides and assistants, etc. These prescriptions or 'special help' can be carried out by the classroom teacher, a Title I aide or assistant, or the consultants themselves. Children who require similar skill remediation can be grouped but diagnosis should be individualized. It is the consultant's job to continually evaluate the progress of these students and provide directions and resources to meet their needs.

"Q. What is the relationship between the Title I program and the Special Education program?

A. Children who spend less than 50% of their time in special education are also eligible for Title I services. Unfortunately, as a result of the rapid growth of both the Special Education and Title I programs in Portland, the lines of demarcation between the two programs have become blurred: both Title I and Special Education now provide remediation in reading and math. During the next year efforts will be made to focus special education resources on children with psycho-motor and perceptual handicaps, while remediation and learning problems of a compensatory nature will be addressed through Title I support.

"Q. How are students selected for inclusion in the Title I program? Is this determined nationally or locally?

A. The amount of Title I money available to the Portland School System is determined by the number of low-income families residing in the City of Portland. Once the money is received by Portland, it is up to the Title I P.A.C. to recommend a method for distributing it to each school. This is currently done on the basis of the total number of students in each Title I school who scored below the 25th percentile in achievement in reading and math on our annual city-wide testing. Therefore, a particular school's share of our System's total allotment is determined by the number of its students who score in the bottom quartile. This year the PAC recommended that in addition to those students scoring below the 25th percentile, other students in each school may be declared eligible for Title I services on the basis of academic need as determined by the reading or math consultant after referral by the teacher or principal. The addition of these "referred" students does not add to the amount of Title I money which each school receives. This Spring, the PAC will reconsider the selection criteria on the basis of the many good suggestions for improvement which Mr. Callanan's evaluation has solicited.

"Q. Who should give Title I aides and assistants their directions for the daily instructional programs?

A. Aides and assistants are assigned students by the reading and math consultants following diagnosis, testing, the development of prescriptions and grouping. They carry out the Title I remedial plan for each child

which is developed and continually evaluated by the consultant. Aides and assistants must work in close cooperation with the classroom teacher. In addition, it is the responsibility of the consultant to maintain frequent communications with the teacher and insure that remedial help provided by the para-professional appropriately supplements the teacher's regular program of instruction for each Title I student.

"Q. What is the nature of the funds which have recently been made available to the Title I program?

A. Recently Portland had the good fortune to receive an additional $59,000 of Title I monies in the form of a "Concentration Grant." This amount is based on the number of low income families in a county. Any U.S. county with 20% or more low income families may qualify. Portland's allocation was based on the proportion of its low income families to the total number of low income families residing in Cumberland County. Like 'regular' Title I monies, the allocation of the concentration grant is based on local information provided through the U.S. Census.

"In Mr. Callanan's next newsletter, I will list all of the specific organizational changes which will be implemented next year to make Portland's Title I program New England's best."

Steve Adamowski

2. SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT: "Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding fine." The Interim Report which was promised for April will be out in April, by George, but will make this deadline just by the skin of its teeth. It should be in Coordinator Adamowski's hands by the last week of this month and I should imagine that you will have an opportunity to look it over shortly thereafter. This report will include among other things those suggestions for program improvements which are the outgrowth of the first cycle of school visits.

3. FEEDBACK: We would appreciate it if you would pass on any comments you have on these recommendations to Title I Evaluation Consultant Chuck Callanan at the Central Office or any questions you still might have about the Title I program.

4. MORE VISITS: The second cycle of evaluation will begin again after vacation. Please note that the original schedule of school observations has been changed and a new timetable will be in each principal's hands by the end of April. Whereas the first cycle emphasized the study of staff and school organization, the second cycle focuses more carefully on the program from the students' point of view and will more carefully examine exactly what supplementary services Title I students receive.

5. PROGRAM ADDITIONS: You may be interested to know how the various elementary schools have utilized the additional money they received from the concentration grant which Steve Adamowski mentioned earlier and the extra money made available when three Title I funded reading consultants were taken over by local funding. Here is what each school added to its Title I program.

A. Jack Elementary School added six aides/assistants and one social worker.

B. Hall School added four aides/assistants. The math consultant formerly half time became full time.

C. Riverton School added one aide/assistant and additional materials.

D. Reiche School added one remedial reading teacher. The math consultant, formerly half time, became full time.

E. Presumpscot added one aide/assistant and additional materials.

F. Nathan Clifford and West Schools decided to offer a Title I summer school program rather than add additional personnel.

6. THE FINAL REPORT: The concluding report which will sum up all the data collected during this evaluation will also report whether or not any relationships can be found between the way various schools are carrying out their Title I programs and the testing results of their students.

Thanks. We do appreciate the help you have given us when we visited you in your schools, and on the second cycle I will try to cause you as little inconvenience as possible.

C. R. Callanan, Evaluation Consultant
Department of Research & Evaluation

April 22, 1980

APPENDIX L

May 1980

Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Process Evaluation of
The Portland Public School Title I Program Grades 4,5, and 6

Directions: Please check the appropriate box(es) below.

1. You are a member of which of the following groups?

☐ a. Aide/Assistant

☐ b. Mathematics consultant

☐ c. Reading Consultant

☐ d. Social worker

☐ e. Classroom teachers

☐ f. Principals

☐ g. Central office personnel

☐ h. Parents Advisory Council

☐ i. Other (please specify)

2. Which one(s) of the following have you read?

☐ a. The Title I Bulletins

☐ b. The Initial Interim Suggestions presented to Steven Adamowski in Feb.1980

☐ c. The main interim report of April 1980

☐ d. The Executive Summary of the Interim Report

☐ e. All of the above

☐ f. None of the above

3. Do you feel that the results of the evaluation to date have been helpful and/or that the suggestions already made are likely to be helpful in the future?

Yes ☐ No ☐

over

4. If your answer to question 3 is "Yes", in which of the following ways has the evaluation been or is likely to be helpful to you?

☐ a. It clarfified program problems that needed to be looked at.

☐ b. It helped improve communications involving the Title I program.

☐ c. It helped me understand my job responsibility better.

☐ d. It helped clarify the Title I guidelines.

☐ e. It proposed some suggestions that might improve the program.

☐ f. Other ways it has proved or is likely to prove helpful: (please specify) _____

_____

5. ☐ Yes ☐ No Is there additional information that you feel should have been obtained but which was not?

6. If the answer to Question 5. is "Yes", what additional information would you have liked to have had included?

(Please be explicit) _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX K

May 1980

Impact of Title I Program on the Teachers

Teacher Code: _____ School Code: _____

Grade: _____

Directions: Please check the responses that apply.

Question 1. In your opinion, the overall impact of the Title I program, upon the children in your class has been:

- ☐ a) extremely positive
- ☐ b) positive
- ☐ c) not noticeable
- ☐ d) negative
- e) Comment:

Question 2. To what extent has your expertise been taken into account while designing and implementing the Title I program?

- ☐ a) To the maximum degree possible
- ☐ b) As effectively as could be expected
- ☐ c) Not as effectively as could be expected
- ☐ d) Has not been taken into account
- e) Comment:

Question 3. To what extent have your responsibilities and problems been taken into account while designing and implementing the Title I program?

- ☐ a) To the maximum degree possible
- ☐ b) As effectively as could be expected
- ☐ c) Not as effectively as could be expected
- ☐ d) Has not been taken into account
- e) Comment:

(over)

Question 4. In which of the following areas has the Title I program and its staff had a significant influence upon you?

☐ YES ☐ NO a) In improving those skills which are needed to work with the underachieving students in the so called 'compensatory education' programs, through such factors as special workshops, consultations and meetings with the Title I staff

☐ YES ☐ NO b) In providing you with good diagnostic and prescriptive information concerning your Title I students

☐ YES ☐ NO c) In giving you a better understanding of the general as well as the specific characteristics of the overall Title I program

☐ YES ☐ NO d) In supplying you or your aide/assistant with appropriate remedial materials for classroom use

e) Others (please specify)

Question 5. Would you briefly but specifically describe any changes -- either positive or negative that have taken place in your classroom as a result of the Title I program.

Comment: _____

_____

APPENDIX M

May 1980

TITLE I DIAGNOSTIC AND PRESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION FORM

School _____ Math Consultant _____

Reading Consultant _____

Grade Level _____

Student's Name _____

Would you please furnish us the following information about the diagnostic work done for the Title I student whose name is given above. Please check the appropriate box.

1. ☐ yes ☐ no Did this student go through a P.E.T. evaluation this year?

2. ☐ yes ☐ no Was any diagnostic testing performed for this student during the 1979-80 school year including P.E.T. evaluations? (Do not include the regular STEP tests given to all students.)

3. If your answer to question #2 is "yes", which tests were used in Reading?

- ☐ a. Portland's Criterion Referenced Test
- ☐ b. Oral Reading Test
- ☐ c. Informal Reading Inventory
- ☐ d. Some standardized test; i.e., Spache, Gates-MacGinitie, etc.
- ☐ e. Basal Placement Test
- ☐ f. End of Book Test
- ☐ g. Classroom observation where a written record was kept
- ☐ h. Other (please specify) _____

4. If your answer to question #2 is "yes", which tests were used in Math?

- ☐ a. Testing for P.E.T.
- ☐ b. Key Math
- ☐ c. Early Alert
- ☐ d. S.R.A. Diagnostic
- ☐ e. Text book series placement Test; i.e., Addison Wesley, D. C. Heath, etc.
- ☐ f. Other (please specify) _____

5. How do you keep this student's diagnostic test results:

- ☐ a. Don't keep them
- ☐ b. Keep them in his/her individualized folder
- ☐ c. Keep them on a master school-wide Title I log
- ☐ d. Keep them by class or by group

6. What specific use was made of this student's test results?

- ☐ a. Group placement
- ☐ b. Individualized program
- ☐ c. Identification for Title I services because the student was new to school
- ☐ d. Other _____

7. ☐ yes ☐ no Was a written prescription drawn up?

8. ☐ yes ☐ no If "no", was it done informally?

9. Who of the following was/were informed of the prescription either formally or informally?

- ☐ a. Teacher
- ☐ b. Teacher aide/assistant
- ☐ c. Principal
- ☐ d. All of the above
- ☐ e. None of the above

10. How was/were the teacher/others informed of the prescription whether written or informal?

- ☐ a. During regularly scheduled conference(s)
- ☐ b. By memo or report
- ☐ c. At an informal unscheduled meeting
- ☐ d. Other (please specify) _____

11. ☐ yes ☐ no Were specific objectives established for this student?

12. ☐ yes ☐ no If "yes", are these objectives in writing?

13. ☐ yes ☐ no Was this student's progress monitored?

14. If your answer to question #13 is "yes", how was this done?

☐ a. Regular meetings with teachers

☐ b. Unscheduled meetings with teachers

☐ c. Meetings with aides/assistants

☐ d. Frequent testing

☐ e. Other (please specify) _____